DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 996 PS 020 683

AUTHOR Gutierrez, Roberto; Slavin, Robert E.
TITLE Achievement Effects of the Nongraded Elementary School: A Retrospective Review.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CDS-R-33
PUB DATE Jun 92
CONTRACT R-117-R-90002
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Comparative Analysis; *Continuous Progress Plan; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *Flexible Progression; Grade Repetition; *Individual Instruction; *Nongraded Instructional Grouping; Nontraditional Education
IDENTIFIERS Individually Guided Education; Joplin Plan; *Mixed Age Groups

ABSTRACT

This article describes the types of nongraded elementary schools that were prevalent from the 1950s through the 1970s, reviews research on the academic achievement effects of nongraded schools, and draws inferences from this research for application of nongraded systems in today's schools. Research in which an objective measure of achievement was used and for which comparability of nongraded and graded samples was established was reviewed. The review established 5 categories of nongraded programs: (1) programs in which students were grouped according to performance in one subject; (2) programs in which students were grouped according to performance in several subjects; (3) programs that used individualized instruction; (4) individually guided education programs; and (5) programs that were not explicitly described in the research. Results indicated consistent positive achievement effects for students in groupings in the first two categories. Nongraded programs that made use of individualized instruction were less consistently successful. It is concluded that nongraded organization has a positive impact on student achievement if it allows teachers to provide direct instruction to students outside of the framework of individualized instruction. A list of 110 references and a set of 6 tables are provided. (BC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: PS UD

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED346996

PS 020683

CDS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Achievement Effects of the Nongraded Elementary School: A Retrospective Review

Roberto Gutiérrez

Robert E. Slavin

Report No. 33

June 1992

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Advisory Panel

Beatriz Arias, College of Education, Arizona State University

Mary Frances Berry, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania

Anthony S. Bryk, Department of Education, University of Chicago

Michael Charleston, Department of Education,
University of Colorado at Denver

Constance E. Clayton, Superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools

Edmund Gordon (Chair), Department of Psychology, Yale University

Ronald D. Henderson, National Education Association

Vinetta Jones, Executive Director, EQUITY 2000, College Board

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent, Hartford Public Schools

Arturo Madrid, Director, Tomas Rivera Center

William Julius Wilson, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

Center Liaison

Harold Himmelfarb, Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Achievement Effects of the Nongraded School: A Retrospective Review

Roberto Gutiérrez and Robert E. Slavin

Grant No. R117 R90002

Report No. 33

June 1992

Published by the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, supported as a national research and development center by funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

The Center

The mission of the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students (CDS) is to significantly improve the education of disadvantaged students at each level of schooling through new knowledge and practices produced by thorough scientific study and evaluation. The Center conducts its research in four program areas: The Early and Elementary Education Program, The Middle Grades and High Schools Program, the Language Minority Program, and the School, Family, and Community Connections Program.

The Early and Elementary Education Program

This program is working to develop, evaluate, and disseminate instructional programs capable of bringing disadvantaged students to high levels of achievement, particularly in the fundamental areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. The goal is to expand the range of effective alternatives which schools may use under Chapter 1 and other compensatory education funding and to study issues of direct relevance to federal, state, and local policy on education of disadvantaged students.

The Middle Grades and High Schools Program

This program is conducting research syntheses, survey analyses, and field studies in middle and high schools. The three types of projects move from basic research to useful practice. Syntheses compile and analyze existing knowledge about effective education of disadvantaged students. Survey analyses identify and describe current programs, practices, and trends in middle and high schools, and allow studies of their effects. Field studies are conducted in collaboration with school staffs to develop and evaluate effective programs and practices.

The Language Minority Program

This program represents a collaborative effort. The University of California at Santa Barbara is focusing on the education of Mexican-American students in California and Texas; studies of dropout among children of recent immigrants are being conducted in San Diego and Miami by Johns Hopkins, and evaluations of learning strategies in schools serving Navajo Indians are being conducted by the University of Northern Arizona. The goal of the program is to identify, develop, and evaluate effective programs for disadvantaged Hispanic, American Indian, Southeast Asian, and other language minority children.

The School, Family, and Community Connections Program

This program is focusing on the key connections between schools and families and between schools and communities to build better educational programs for disadvantaged children and youth. Initial work is seeking to provide a research base concerning the most effective ways for schools to interact with and assist parents of disadvantaged students and interact with the community to produce effective community involvement.

Achievement Effects of the Nongraded Elementary School: A Retrospective Review

Abstract

A nongraded elementary program is one in which children are flexibly grouped according to performance level, not age, and proceed through the elementary school at their own rates. Popular in the 1950's, '60's, and early '70's, the nongraded plan is returning today. This article reviews research on the achievement effects of nongraded organization. Results indicated consistent positive achievement effects of simple forms of nongrading generally developed early: cross-grade grouping for one subject (median ES = +.46) and cross-grade grouping for many subjects (median ES = +.34). Forms of nongrading making extensive use of individualization were less consistently successful (median ES = +.02). Studies of Individually Guided Education, which used nongrading and individualization, also produced inconsistent effects (median ES = +.11). The article concludes that nongraded organization can have a positive impact on student achievement if cross-age grouping is used to allow teachers to provide more direct instruction to students, but not if it is used as a framework for individualized instruction.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Robert H. Anderson and John Goodlad for their comments on an earlier version of this report.

Introduction

> Greek mythology tells us of the cruel robber, Procrustes (the stretcher). When travelers sought his house for shelter, they were tied to an iron bedstead. If the traveler was shorter than the bed, Procrustes stretched him until he was the same length as the bed. If he was longer, his limbs were chopped off to make him fit. Procrustes shaped both short and tall until they were equally long and equally dead.
>
> [Graded systems of school organization] trap school-age travelers in much the same fashion as Procrustes bed trapped the unwary. (Goodlad & Anderson, 1959, p. 1).

So begins the book that launched one of the most interesting innovations in the history of education: *The Nongraded Elementary School*, by John Goodlad and Robert Anderson. The nongraded elementary school movement was an important force in North American education in the 1960's and early 1970's, even if its major elements were only implemented in a small proportion of schools.

The challenge to the traditional age-graded classroom posed by the nongraded concept is one that still has relevance today, and the nongraded elementary school itself is reappearing in U.S. schools. Recently, the states of Kentucky and Oregon have promoted a shift to nongraded programs, and many districts and schools elsewhere are moving in this direction (Willis, 1991).

A great deal of research has been done to evaluate various forms of the nongraded elementary school, but there are few comprehensive reviews on this topic. McLoughlin (1967), reviewing studies done up to 1966, concluded that most found no differences between graded and nongraded programs in reading, arithmetic, and language arts performance. In contrast, Pavan (1977), who limited her review of achievement to studies reported between 1968 and 1976, concluded that most comparisons favored the nongraded plan.

However, both of these reviews were quite limited. Both simply counted statistically significant findings favoring graded or nongraded programs, paying little attention to the particular forms of nongrading used, the methodological quality of the studies, or the size of the effects.

The purpose of this article is to describe the nongraded elementary school in its earlier incarnations, to systematically review research on the academic achievement effects of nongraded schooling, and to draw inferences from this research for applications of the nongraded ideal in today's schools.

What Is a Nongraded Elementary School?

The term nongraded (or ungraded) elementary school covers a wide range of school and classroom organizational arrangements. Central to the concept is the elimination of traditional grade level designations. Instead, students are grouped according to their level of academic performance, not their ages. Sometimes this grouping is done for just one subject, sometimes for many subjects, and sometimes students are placed in self-contained multi-age classrooms according to reading performance or general ability. For example, a nongraded reading class might contain six-,

seven-, and eight-year-old students, all reading at what would ordinarily be considered the second grade level. Students are allowed to proceed through the grades at their own rates. Some may take longer than usual to complete the elementary grades, while others may complete elementary school in less time than usual. Because a school has classes at many levels, a child who spurts ahead or falls behind can easily be moved to another class appropriate to his or her level. As a result, no child is ever retained or skipped a whole grade at once.

Frequently, the nongraded program applies only to the primary grades (1-3 or K-3), and is called a nongraded primary school. This is the main form that is returning today (Willis, 1991). The idea is that all students will have a certain level of academic performance on entering fourth grade, but may have taken more or less time to reach this level.

In their original conception, nongraded elementary schools usually incorporated a curriculum structure called "continuous progress," in which the skills to be learned in such subjects as reading and mathematics are organized into a hierarchical series of levels covering all the grades involved in the plan (usually 1-3 or 1-6). For example, the reading curriculum ordinarily taught in grades 1-3 might be organized in four levels per grade, for a total of twelve levels for the entire nongraded period leading to grade four.

In a continuous-progress model, students pick up each year where they left off the previous year. For example, a low achiever who has only completed Level 5 at the end of his second year would start with Level 6 at the beginning of his third year (rather than being retained in second grade, as might occur in a graded school). A high achiever who mastered Level 12 at the end of her second year might simply go to fourth grade a year early.

Goodlad and Anderson (1963) recommended having such a hierarchical structure only for hierarchical subjects, such as reading and math, and using interest groupings, age groupings, or other criteria for subjects (such as social studies and science) which depend to a lesser degree on prerequisite skills.

Beyond the use of flexible, multi-age groupings, actual operationalizations of the nongraded elementary school model have varied enormously. At one end of a continuum of complexity, nongraded organization is essentially equivalent to the Joplin Plan (Floyd, 1954; Slavin, 1987). This is an arrangement in which students are grouped across grade lines for just one subject, almost always reading. For example, at a common reading period all students might move to a class composed of students at the same performance level in reading drawn from different classes and grade levels; a second grade, first semester reading class might have first, second, and third graders in it. Students move through a continuous-progress sequence of reading levels which cover the material students are expected to learn in all grades involved in the plan. They move as rapidly as they are able to go, taking as much time as they need to master the material. Groupings are frequently reassessed and changed if student performance warrants it.

The main effect of the use of the Joplin Plan is to reduce the number of reading groups taught by each teacher, often to one (i.e., whole-class instruction), thereby reducing the difficulties inherent in managing multiple groups and reducing the need for students to do follow-up activities independently of the teacher.

The Joplin Plan can be described as a nongraded reading program which still maintains an age-graded organization for other subjects. Studies of the Joplin Plan, which was popular in the 1950's and '60's, do not make it clear what happened when students reached the end of the elementary grades and were reading at a level quite different from their grade level.

In the 1960's, nongraded programs began to more closely resemble the model described by Goodlad and Anderson (1963), which suggested flexible multi-age grouping for most or all academic subjects, with

continuous-progress curricula for such subjects as reading and mathematics.

When it was first described and implemented in the 1950's and early '60's, nongraded organization primarily involved changes in grouping patterns, not instructional methods. Teachers in the earlier implementations still overwhelmingly taught students in groups using traditional methods and curricula.

Starting in the late 1960's, however, the nongraded plan often absorbed another innovation becoming popular at that time, individualized instruction. Increasingly, descriptions of nongraded schools began to include the extensive use of learning stations, learning activity packets, and other individualized, student-directed activities. In many cases these individual activities were also combined with tasks students completed in small groups which primarily worked independently of the teacher.

Another typical attribute of these forms of nongrading was team teaching. For example, two to six teachers might occupy a section of the school and take joint responsibility for a large group of students, flexibly grouping and regrouping them throughout the day. As time went on, programs of this kind were increasingly implemented in schools without classroom walls, and tended to be called open schools rather than nongraded elementary schools (see Giaconia & Hedges, 1982). In an introduction to the 1987 reprinting of their 1963 book, Goodlad and Anderson acknowledge the essential commonality between the two approaches.

A good summary of the goals and elements of a fully realized operationalization of the nongraded ideal is adapted by Goodlad and Anderson (1987, pp. xv-xviii) from the dissertation of Barbara Pavan (1972), who was the principal of one of the earliest model nongraded elementary schools and continues to be an important advocate of this approach. It is presented below.

I. *Goals of Schooling*

1. The ultimate school goal is to develop self-directing autonomous individuals.

2. The school should help develop individual potentialities to the maximum possible.

3. Each individual is unique and is accorded dignity and respect. Differences in people are valued. Therefore the school should strive to increase the variability of individual differences rather than stress conformity.

4. Development of the child must be considered in all areas: aesthetic, physical, emotional, and social, as well as intellectual.

5. Those involved in the school enterprise are co-learners, especially teachers and students.

6. The school atmosphere should allow children to enjoy learning, to experience work as pleasurable and rewarding, and to be content with themselves.

II. *Administrative-Organizational Framework*

A. Vertical Grouping

7. Each individual works in varied situations where he or she will have opportunities for maximum progress. There are no procedures for retention or promotion, nor any grade levels.

8. A child's placement may be changed at any time if it is felt to be in the best interests of the child's development considering all five phases of development: aesthetic, physical, intellectual, emotional, and social.

B. Horizontal Grouping

9. Grouping and subgrouping patterns are extremely flexible. Learners are grouped and regrouped on the basis of one specific task and are disbanded when that objective is reached.

10. Each child should have opportunities to work with groups of many sizes, including one-person groups, formed for different purposes.

11. The specific task, materials required, and student needs determine the number of students that may be profitably engaged in any given educational experience.

12. Children should have frequent contact with children and adults of varying personalities, backgrounds, abilities, interests, and ages.

III. Operational *Elements*

A. Teaching Materials-Instructional

13. A wide variety of textbooks, trade books, supplemental materials, workbooks, and teaching aids must be available and readily accessible in sufficient quantities.

14. Varied materials must be available to cover a wide range of reading abilities.

15. Alternate methods and materials will be available at any time so that the child may use the learning style and materials most suitable to his or her present needs and the task at hand (including skill building, self-teaching, self-testing, and sequenced materials).

16. A child is not really free to learn something she or he has not been exposed to. The teacher is responsible for providing a broad range of experiences and materials that will stimulate many interests in the educational environment.

B. Curriculum (knowledge)

17. The unique needs, interests, abilities, and learning rates, styles and patterns of each child will determine his or her individual curriculum. Conformity and rigidity are not demanded.

18. The curriculum should be organized to develop the understanding of concepts and methods of inquiry more than specific content learning.

19. Process goals will be stressed: the development of the skills of inquiry, evaluation, interpretation, application - "the skills of learning to learn."

20. Sequence of learning must be determined by each individual student and his or her teacher, since:

(a) no logical or inherent sequence is in the various curriculum areas.

(b) no predetermined sequence is appropriate to all learners.

(c) individual differences in level of competence and in interest are constantly in flux.

21. Each child will formulate his or her own learning goals with guidance from his or her teachers.

C. Teaching Methods

22. Different people learn in different ways.

23. Learning is the result of the student's interaction with the world she or he inhabits. Individuals learn by direct experience and manipulation of their environment: therefore the child must be allowed to explore, to experiment, to "mess around," to play, and have the freedom to err.

24. The process is more important than the product. How the child learns is stressed.

25 All phases of human growth-aesthetic, physical, intellectual, emotional, and social-are considered when planning learning experiences for a child.

26. The teacher is a facilitator of learning. She or he aids in the child's development by helping each one to formulate goals, diagnose problem areas, suggest alternative plans of action; provides resource materials and gives encouragement, support, or prodding as needed.

27. Children should work on the level appropriate to present attainment and should move as quickly as their abilities and desires allow them to.

28. Successful completion of challenging experiences promotes greater confidence and motivation to learn than fear of failure.

29. Learning experiences based on the child's expressed interests will motivate the child to continue and complete a task successfully much more frequently than teacher-contrived techniques.

D. Evaluation and Reporting

30. Children are evaluated in terms of their past achievements and their own potential, not by comparison to group norms. Expectations differ for different children.

31. Evaluation by teacher and/or child is done for diagnostic purposes and results in the formulation of new education objectives.

32. Evaluation must be continuous and comprehensive to fulfill its diagnostic purpose.

33. A child strives mainly to improve his or her performance and develop potential rather than to compete with others.

34. Teachers accept and respond to the fact that growth patterns will be irregular and will occur in differentareas at different times.

35. Individual pupil progress forms are used to record the learning tasks completed, deficiencies that need new assignments to permit mastery, and all other data that will show the child's progress in relation to past achievements and potential or that will help the teacher in suggesting possible future learning experiences for the individual.

36. Evaluating and reporting will consider all five areas of the child's development: aesthetic, physical, intellectual, emotional, and social.

Rationales for Nongrading

The major rationale for a nongraded approach is to provide an alternative to both retention and social promotion (i.e., promoting students regardless of performance). In the view of Goodlad and Anderson (1963) and many who followed them (e.g., Shepard & Smith, 1989), retention is harmful to students, is applied inconsistently, and fails to take into account developmental inconsistencies (e.g., "late bloomers"), especially among young children.

A retained child repeats a whole year of content he or she failed to learn the first time. Spending a year failing to learn a body of curriculum and then spending a second year going over the same curriculum seems to be a poor practice for low achievers. Advocates of nongrading would argue that it is far better to allow such students to move more slowly through material with a high success rate and never have to repeat unlearned content. As noted earlier, nongraded elementary programs use a "continuous progress" plan, in which a hierarchical curriculum (such as reading or mathematics) is divided into some number of units across the grades, and then students can take as much time as they need to complete the units.

A low achiever moving slowly through a continuous progress curriculum may take as many years to reach the fourth grade as a

similar low achiever in a graded structure who is retained at some point in grades 1-3, but advocates of nongrading would argue that the continuous progress plan is less stigmatizing, less psychologically damaging, and more instructionally sensible than retention.

Nongraded organization also offers an alternative to traditional forms of ability grouping. Goodlad and Anderson (1963) point out how nongrading can be an improvement on both between-class ability grouping (e.g., high, middle, and low self-contained second grades) and within-class ability grouping (e.g., reading groups). The problem with between-class ability grouping, they argue, is that grouping on any one criterion (such as reading performance or general ability) cannot group students well for any particular skill. For example, a class grouped according to reading skill will have a very broad range of math levels, and will even be quite diverse in performance levels on any particular reading task. As a result, the costs of ability grouping in terms of stigmatizing low achievers are not compensated for by any practically meaningful reduction in heterogeneity.

Formation of reading groups within heterogeneous classes is similarly flawed in their view. In order to create homogeneous groups, teachers must have many reading groups and therefore much class time must be spent on follow-up activities of little instructional value.

In the nongraded plan, students are flexibly grouped for major subjects (especially reading and math) across class and age lines, so that the resulting groups are truly homogeneous on the skills being taught. Further, by creating multi-age groups from among all students in contiguous grade levels, it is possible for teachers to create entire reading or math classes at one or, at most, two levels, so that they need not devote much class time to follow-up.

Finally, the nongraded plan is proposed as a solution to the problem of split grades. In many schools with, for example, a class size of 25 and 38 students in each of grades two and three, principals would create one second grade class, one third grade class, and a 2-3 combination class. In a graded structure teaching the 2-3 class is difficult, as the two portions of the class may be taught completely separately. A nongraded organization, by eliminating the designation of students as second or third graders, solves this problem.

The rationale for the re-emergence of the nongraded plan today is similar to that of the 1950's. In the 1980's, retention rates increased dramatically in elementary schools, especially those in large cities (Levine & Eubanks, 1986-87). This was partly a result of accountability pressures, which focus on performance of students according to grade level, not age, thereby rewarding districts for such policies as imposing grade-to-grade promotion standards and holding back low achievers (see McGill-Franzen & Allington 1991; Slavin & Madden, 1991).

However, in more recent years a reaction against high retention rates has taken place, influenced in particular by the work of Shepard and Smith (1989) documenting the negative long-term effects of retention in the elementary grades. Unwilling to return to social promotion (and still under accountability pressures which discourage it), many school districts are currently experimenting with a variety of means of holding standards constant while allowing time spent in the early grades to vary. Among these is the growing use of means of adding a year between kindergarten and second grade for at-risk children, such as developmental kindergarten, junior kindergarten, transitional first grade, or pre-first programs. However, research on the long-term impacts of these approaches has questioned their value (see Karweit, in press). The nongraded primary has been rediscovered as a means of avoiding both retention and social promotion, just as it was in the 1950's.

Another rationale for the nongraded primary school still important today is a reaction against traditional ability grouping. Between-class ability grouping (e.g., high, middle, and low second grades) has been used by a

minority of elementary schools, but use of reading groups has been almost universal until very recently (McPartland, Coldiron, and Braddock, 1987). At present, many schools are seeking alternatives to the use of set reading groups (see Barr, 1990) and the nongraded program appears to be a means of doing away with reading groups while still allowing teachers to accommodate instruction to individual needs.

An important factor today in the move toward the nongraded primary that was not a rationale in the 1950's is the trend toward "developmentally appropriate" practices in the early grades. By this is meant instructional approaches which allow young children to develop skills at their own pace. For example, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1989) published a position statement entitled *Appropriate Education in the Primary Grades* which described developmentally appropriate education for children ages 5-8. Among the prescriptions were the following:

> Each child is viewed as a unique person with an individual pattern and timing of growth... Children are allowed to move at their own pace in acquiring important skills... For example, it is accepted that not every child will learn how to read at age 6, most will learn by 7, and some will need intensive exposure to appropriate literacy experiences to learn to read by 8 or 9. (p. 4).

The NAEYC position paper also supported integrated curriculum and instruction, extensive use of projects and learning stations, cooperative learning, and other strategies quite consistent with the nongraded primary plans of the late 1960's and early '70's (and with the open classroom of the same period).

Individually Guided Education

One important outgrowth of the nongraded concept was Individually Guided Education (IGE), developed and researched by Klausmeier and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin (Klausmeier, Rossmiller, & Saily, 1977). IGE, in its Wisconsin version or in the one developed by the Kettering Foundation (through I/D/E/A), was a very ambitious, comprehensive restructuring of elementary education. It used a nongraded grouping strategy, in which students were flexibly grouped according to instructional needs rather than age.

As in any nongraded elementary school, students could take as much time as they needed to complete the objectives prescribed for each subject. However, IGE affected all aspects of school organization and instruction, not only grouping. Individual plans were prepared for each student, and students were constantly assessed to determine their continuing placements. Instruction could be delivered one-on-one by teachers or peers, to small groups, or (rarely) to large groups.

Extensive use was made of learning stations at which students could perform experiments, work on individualized units, or do other individual or small group activities independently of the teacher. Comprehensive instructional models were developed and implemented in reading, mathematics, social studies, and science. Students were organized into multi-age Instruction and Research (I & R) units of 100 to 150 students with (ideally) a "unit leader," three to five "staff teachers," an aide, and a teacher intern. This team planned and carried out the instruction students received in all subjects. Often, individual teachers would become experts in a given subject and take responsibility for that subject with the entire unit. A building-level Instructional Improvement Committee worked to establish objectives and policies for the school as a whole.

Review Methods

This review synthesizes the findings of research comparing the achievement effects of nongraded and traditional organizations in the elementary grades (K-6). The review method used is best-evidence synthesis (Slavin, 1986), which combines elements of meta-analysis (Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981) with those of narrative reviews. Briefly, a best-evidence synthesis requires locating all research on a given topic, establishing well-specified criteria of methodological adequacy and germaneness to the topic, and then reviewing this "best evidence" with attention to the substantive and methodological contributions of each study. Whenever possible, study outcomes are characterized in terms of effect sizes, the difference between the experimental and control means divided by the control group's standard deviation. Details of the review procedures are described in the following sections.

Literature Search Procedures

Every effort was made to obtain every study ever reported which met the broad substantive inclusion criteria described below. Principal sources included the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Dissertation Abstracts, and the reference lists of earlier reviews and of the primary studies themselves. Most of the studies located were doctoral dissertations. These were obtained from University Microfilms International or from the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, which maintains microfilm copies of all U.S. dissertations. In a few cases where unpublished documents could not be found or where clarifications were needed about important studies, authors were contacted directly.

Substantive Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included in an initial search if they identified themselves as evaluating nongraded, ungraded, multi-age, or Individually Guided Education programs in grades K-6. Studies spanning elementary and middle grades were included, but only data up to grade 6 were considered.

Methodological Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following methodological criteria, which are identical to those applied in earlier reviews of ability grouping by Slavin (1987, 1990):

1. Some objective measure of achievement was used. Because of their subjective nature, grades were not included as achievement variables. In practice, all achievement outcomes were assessed using standardized measures.

2. Initial comparability of the nongraded and graded samples was established by means of random assignment of students, matching of schools or classes, or matching of individual students within classes or schools. In studies using matching, evidence had to be presented either to indicate that the groups were initially equivalent (within 20% of a standard deviation) or, if they were not equivalent, pretest data were presented to allow for adjustment of posttest scores for pretest differences. Studies which used gain scores or analyses of covariance to control for initial differences between nongraded and graded programs are listed in separate portions of each table, as adjustment for pretest differences cannot be assumed to completely control for their influence on posttests (see Reichart, 1979). Results of these studies should be interpreted cautiously.

3. The nongraded program was in place for at least a semester. All studies located met this standard; in fact, only two studies were less than a year in duration.

Very few studies which used any achievement measure to compare nongraded and graded programs were excluded on the

basis of these inclusion criteria. Examples of studies excluded are ones which involved nongraded secondary schools (e.g., Chalfant, 1972), studies without any evidence that nongraded and control groups were initially equivalent and without adjustments for pretests (e.g., Ingram, 1960), and studies of school organization plans related to but not the same as the nongraded program (e.g., Heathers, 1967; Maresh, 1971).

Studies were *not* excluded if they met the above criteria but failed to present data which would allow for computation of effect sizes. Instead, such studies were discussed in the review and were included in all tables with an indication of the direction and statistical significance of any differences (see below).

Computation of Effect Sizes

Whenever possible, effect sizes were computed as in earlier reviews of ability grouping by Slavin (1987, 1990). In general, effect size was computed as the difference between the nongraded and graded program's means divided by the graded program's standard deviation. When means or standard deviations were omitted, effect sizes were estimated from t's, F's, p's, or other statistics, using procedures described by Glass, McGaw, & Smith (1981). However, one important variation in the Glass et al. procedures was used when appropriate. If pretest scores were available, posttests were adjusted for them using ANCOVA's or gain scores. However, denominators in the effect size computations were always unadjusted individual-level posttest standard deviations. The purpose of these procedures is to avoid situations in which one treatment exceeded another at pretest *and* posttest to the same degree yet the posttest difference was coded as meaningful. See Slavin (1987) for more on this adjustment procedure and other details of effect size computation.

For some purposes, effect sizes were pooled across studies. Whenever this was done, medians (not means) were computed on all studies from which effect size estimates could be derived. Pooling effect sizes within well-defined categories of studies can provide a useful summary of the size and direction of effects but the pooled estimate should always be evaluated in light of the quality and consistency of the individual studies narratively described in the text.

Categories of Nongraded Programs

As noted earlier, nongraded elementary schools have varied widely in their particulars. This variation is not surprising, given that the original conception of the nongraded idea did not pretend to touch on all aspects of school organization and instruction:

> Nongrading is a scheme for organizing schools vertically. It does not account for the many problems of organizing schools horizontally (Goodlad & Anderson, 1963, p. 210).

In looking at studies of nongraded elementary schools over time, an interesting pattern emerges. The earlier studies tended to apply nongrading to only one subject, usually reading. As time went on, studies began to include more than one subject, but to still maintain traditional curriculum and instruction; later still, nongraded programs began to incorporate much more radical changes in curriculum and instruction, along with increased use of team teaching, individualized instruction, learning stations, peer tutoring, cooperative learning, and so on. Individually Guided Education (IGE) represented a full flowering of this form of nongrading.

It is possible to distinguish four distinct categories of nongraded programs, and this review considers each type separately. These are as follows.

1. *Nongraded Programs Involving Only One Subject (Joplin-Like Programs)*

   Nine studies, all reported in the 1950's or '60's, evaluated nongraded plans which only involved one subject. The subject was reading in eight studies, math in one.

2. *Nongraded Programs Involving Multiple Subjects (Comprehensive Programs)*

   Fourteen studies, reported from the late 1950's or '60's to the early 1980's, evaluated nongraded plans incorporating two or more subjects (and often including all academic subjects). This category adheres most closely to the original conception put forward by Goodlad & Anderson (1963), in that the nongraded programs emphasize continuous progress and flexible, multiage grouping, but do not place a major emphasis on individualized instruction.

3. *Nongraded Programs Incorporating Individualized Instruction*

   Eleven studies, all but one reported in the brief period of 1969-1973, evaluated nongraded programs which emphasized individualized instruction, learning stations, learning activity packages, programmed instruction, and/or tutoring.

4. *Individually Guided Education (IGE)*

   Ten studies evaluated implementations of Individually Guided Education (IGE), described earlier. This was the latest group of studies, with reports appearing over the period 1972-1985.

5. *Studies Lacking an Explicit Description of the Nongraded Program*

   In addition to the four categories discussed above, there were twelve studies that failed to state what was actually implemented in the nongraded programs they evaluated. These were generally ex post facto studies, often with large samples, in which the researchers simply accepted principals' words that their schools were nongraded. Given the considerable diversity among implementations that were described, it would be foolish to assume anything about what the independent variable in these studies really was. However, this category is included for the sake of completeness.

Research on Nongraded Programs

The following five sections discuss the research on each of the categories of nongraded programs described above. Each section contains a table that summarizes the major characteristics and findings of (a) randomized studies, then (b) matched equivalent studies, and finally (c) matched studies lacking evidence of initial equality, and within these categories the larger studies are listed first. The text usually follows the same order. In general, then, studies listed and discussed earlier in each section can be considered higher in methodological quality than those which come later.

In each table, effect sizes are presented for each measure or subgroup used, and then an overall effect size is presented. Asterisks by effect sizes indicate that the differences were statistically significant, according to the authors. When effect sizes could not be computed, outcomes are characterized as favoring nongraded (+), no difference (0), or favoring graded (-), with asterisks if the differences were significant. A key to all symbols and abbreviations used in all tables appears in an appendix.

Joplin-Like Nongraded Programs

Table 1 summarizes the research on nongraded programs that have as a distinctive feature the homogeneous grouping of students according to performance level in only one subject. These plans can be labeled Joplin-like programs since they share with

the Joplin Plan the idea of regrouping students for just one subject (usually reading), ignoring grade levels or ages. Nine studies, all done during the 1960's, are included in this category. Most of them were described under the Joplin Plan arrangement in an earlier synthesis of ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools (Slavin, 1987). These studies appeared early in the nongraded movement, suggesting that the earlier implementations were more conservative (affecting only one subject) than those which appeared later.

Results from five of the nine studies found strong positive effects for the nongraded plans, three studies reported no differences between them and graded plans, and one significantly favored the graded program.

==========
Table 1 Here
==========

Hillson, Jones, Moore, and Van Devender (1967) randomly assigned students and teachers to nongraded or traditional classes. Students in the nongraded classes were assigned to heterogeneous classes but regrouped across grade levels for reading. They proceeded through nine reading levels and were continually regrouped on the basis of their reading performance. Within each reading class teachers had multiple reading groups and used traditional basal readers and instructional methods. The results of this study supported the efficacy of the nongraded program. After three semesters, reading scores for experimental students on three standardized scales were considerably higher than for control students (ES = +.72, or about +.41 grade equivalents). After three years in the program, experimental-control differences had diminished but were still moderately positive (ES = +.33).

Three studies compared Joplin-like nongraded classes to matched control classes and presented evidence of initial comparability. In the largest of these, Halliwell (1963) evaluated a nongraded primary that was virtually identical to the Joplin Plan. Students in first through third grades were regrouped for reading only, and remained in heterogeneous classes the rest of the day. Spelling was also included in the regrouped classes for second and third graders. The article is unclear as to whether within-class grouping was used in regrouped reading classes, but there is some indication that reading groups were not used.

Results indicated considerably higher reading achievement in nongraded classes than in the same school the year before nongrading was introduced (ES = +.53). Scores were higher for nongraded students at every grade level, but by far the largest differences were for first graders, who exceeded earlier first grade classes by +.94 grade equivalents (ES = +1.22).

It is important to note that mathematics achievement, measured at the second and third grade levels, also increased significantly more in the nongraded classes than in previous years (ES = +.51). Because mathematics was not part of the nongraded program, this finding suggests the possibility that factors other than the nongraded plan might account for the increases in student academic achievement. However, the author notes that teachers claimed to have been able to devote more time to mathematics because the nongraded program required less time for reading, spelling, and language instruction than they had spent on these subjects in previous years.

A study by Skapski (1960) also evaluated the use of a Joplin-like nongraded organization for reading only. The details of the nongraded program were not clearly described, but it appears that reading groups were not used in regrouped classes and that curricula and teaching methods were traditional. Two comparisons were made.

First, the reading scores of students in the nongraded program were compared to the same students' arithmetic scores, on the assumption that because arithmetic was not involved in the nongraded plan any differences would reflect an effect of nongrading. Results of this comparison indicated that second and third grade-aged students achieved an average of 1.1 grade

equivalents higher in reading than in arithmetic.

Second, scores of third graders who had spent 3 years in the nongraded program were compared to those students in two control schools matched on IQ. Results indicated that the nongraded students achieved at a much higher level in reading than did control students (ES = +.57), but there were no differences in arithmetic (which was not involved in the nongraded program). Differences were particularly large for students with IQs of 125 or higher (ES = +.91), but were still quite substantial for students with IQs in the range 88-112 (ES = +.52).

Only one study evaluated the use of a Joplin-like program in mathematics. This is a study by Hart (1962). Experimental students were regrouped for arithmetic instruction across grade lines and were taught as a whole class. Students were frequently assessed on arithmetic skills and reassigned to different classes if their performance indicated that a different level of instruction was needed. Experimental students who had spent 3 years in the nongraded arithmetic program were matched on IQ, age, and SES with students in similar schools using traditional methods. It is not stated whether control classes used within-class ability grouping for arithmetic instruction. Results indicated an advantage of about one half of a grade equivalent for the experimental group
(ES = +.46).

Five studies matched Joplin-like nongraded classes with graded ones, and dealt statistically with initial differences among students. In a study in Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Bockrath (1958) analyzed the largest sample. She conducted three studies in one: first, a comparison of the fourth grade reading test scores of 1953 and 1956 in the 366 schools of the Archdiocese (12,450 students); second, the same comparison for a stratified sample of 50 of these schools (3,596 students); and third, a three-year study of one of the Archdiocesan schools to examine how the nongraded primary functioned (106 students).

In 1956, students had been in nongraded program for three years, while the 1953 pupils had received graded instruction. Besides a one point difference in IQ, the students differed in entrance age. An effort was made by the author to adjust the fourth grade reading score medians in relation to IQ, but only a narrative description took into account the new entrance age adopted for the second group of students (a mean increase of two months for first year primary entrants in 1953). The results clearly favored the nongraded plan (ES = +.51), which was characterized by the creation of flexible skill-level groupings.

The only study of a Joplin-like program that found a clear advantage for a graded plan is presented by Moore (1963). First and second grade students' reading and arithmetic achievement scores were compared for nongraded and conventionally graded schools. Following comparable instructional practices, second grade students' reading scores in the graded and nongraded schools did not differ significantly (ES = -.12). However, a substantial difference favoring the graded program was found among first graders' reading scores (ES = -.70). As the author surveyed teachers concerning which reading materials their pupils were using, he found that first grade control students were reading approximately one basal reading text higher than the experimental group. Arithmetic scores did not differ for first and second grade students, but no description is given of the instruction in this subject.

Enevoldsen (1961) did another study that found schools which differed in label rather than in organizational structure. The graded and nongraded schools chosen from the same public system had similar nongraded reading programs. Consequently, no significant difference was found in students' reading achievement. Two additional studies of relatively low quality, by Jacquette (1959) and Kierstead (1963), reported effect sizes that were close to zero. Both studies stated that learning levels established in the nongraded programs followed very closely the sequential pattern of graded reading

skills, and as a result few differences in outcomes were found.

Summary and discussion: Joplin-like nongraded programs. Overall, the findings of methodologically adequate studies of this type of nongraded program are consistent. All studies exhibiting good methodological quality (randomized and matched studies with evidence of initial equality) found substantial positive results in favor of the nongraded program. The median effect size for the four best-quality studies is + .50; for all studies from which effect sizes could be estimated, it is + .46. The matched studies lacking evidence of initial equality that do not report positive results are characterized by similar reading programs; the biggest difference between them appears to be their label.

Two features are important in almost all of the successful nongraded programs evaluated. One is flexibility in pupil grouping, with frequent assessment of mastery at each level. The second is increased amounts of teaching time for the homogeneous instructional groups. Because each teacher had to manage fewer groups, there was less need for independent follow-up activities, such as worksheets in reading. Perhaps this last characteristic is one of the most important elements that favors students in a nongraded program: more homogeneous groups allow teachers to define more specific objectives for instruction and children receive a greater amount of direct teaching.

Comprehensive Nongraded Programs

Fourteen studies, summarized in Table 2, describe plans in which more than one subject was nongraded. These were conducted from the late 1960's to the beginning of the 1980's. Only three evaluations present small (and non-significant) negative total effect sizes, while eight of the ten that present results favoring the nongraded plans report statistically significant differences.

==========
Table 2 Here
==========

Among the eight studies with evidence of initial equality, Brody's (1970) is the one with a largest sample size. It evaluated a nongraded program in which first and second graders had to pass a series of sequential steps in several subjects at 90% mastery, and were placed in groups according to their mastery of specific skills (regardless of grade level). Vertical advancement of students was strongly emphasized. At the time of assessment, first graders had been in this program one year and second graders two years. Both groups of students gained significantly more than did students in graded classes (ES = +.20). Effects were particularly large in mathematics (ES = +.73). This study was somewhat flawed by the fact that before matching, the nongraded students were 5.4 points higher in IQ than their graded counterparts.

The only matched equivalent study to find no differences in achievement between nongraded and graded programs was one done by Otto (1969), which took place in a laboratory school at the University of Texas. Unlike many other studies of nongraded plans, this study fully described the nongraded intervention, which was designed to be a full-scale implementation of the Goodlad and Anderson (1963) nongraded plan.

Unfortunately, experimental and control groups did not differ on many elements held to be essential to the nongraded program. Teachers of the nongraded classes did assign students to instructional groups across grade lines, had students use materials suited to different levels, and provided less whole-class instruction than did teachers in the graded program. However, the nongraded classes did not use more subgroups than graded classes and did not reduce the heterogeneity of subgroups. Because the experiment took place in a laboratory school, it may be that control classes were of high quality and control teachers may have used many aspects of nongrading in their classes.

It is interesting to note that two other studies conducted in university laboratory schools by Muck (1966) and Ross (1967) also failed to find differences between nongraded and

graded classes. The principal differences between the graded and nongraded programs in the Muck study concern the sequence in which the curriculum was taught and the policy that children in the nongraded program remain with the same teacher for three years while three different teachers faced students in the graded plan. These are not key issues in the usual characterization of the nongraded approach.

Perrin (1969) also found slight differences in favor of the nongraded plans (ES = +.11). As he analyzed the data at the end of each year in a three-year study, it became clear that as time passed, the results started to differ significantly. Perrin evaluated a nongraded program in which a minimum skills chart was used to trace the progress of each child. These basic skills in reading, language, and arithmetic were divided into levels, and children moved through them at their own paces.

Buffie (1962) compared the scores children obtained during their last year of a graded or nongraded primary program. In the graded plan, pupils worked on the same program at the same time in all subjects except reading. In the nongraded plan, grouping within as well as between classrooms was done in reading, arithmetic, and spelling. Team teaching practiced in the nongraded schools also differentiated the plans. The results favor the nongraded plan (total ES = +.34), especially on the language subtest (ES = +.67).

Another study that pointed out sharp differences in the instructional practices of the two groups compared was done by Guarino (1982). Using an index for nongradedness (Pavan, 1972), he tested the congruence between labels and structures. The main distinction was that grouping in the nongraded program was intended to provide an appropriate level of instruction for all students, and was guided by frequently administered diagnostic tests to discover deficiencies in skill areas. High and low achievers in the graded program had problems in receiving instruction appropriate to their special needs. The standardized scores differed significantly in favor of the nongraded program (total ES = +.34), especially in the reading subtests (ES = +.49) and for the older students.

Ramayya (1972) reported positive results for the sixth year students in a nongraded school (total ES = +.42). For six years, these students attended reading and arithmetic classes that were reorganized into several levels. This study confirms the findings reported by Perrin, Brody, Buffie, and Guarino: the longer the duration of the nongraded program, the greater its favorable impact on student academic achievement.

Among the matched studies lacking evidence of initial equality, the largest was a study by Zerby (1960). Instructional practices were similar in the two programs he compared. Reading and arithmetic texts differed between programs, and the nongraded program provided the students with the same teacher for all three years, while different teachers every year instructed children in the graded plan. Despite the resemblance in instructional practices, the results significantly favored the nongraded program (total ES = +.34), especially in arithmetic (ES = +.57).

Lawson (1973) and Morris (1968) conducted studies that have several similarities. Reading and mathematics programs were organized by levels, and regrouping allowed teachers to teach classes of students all at one level in each subject. In the nongraded plans studied, team teaching was described by Lawson, while Morris emphasized the fact that teachers did not face more than two different ability groups per class. Both studies found positive results which increased with time. After three and five years, significant differences favored the nongraded programs.

After only one year of intervention, Chastain (1961) evaluated the academic achievement of students in an intermediate school that shifted from a graded structure to achievement-level grouping in reading classes and finally to a nongraded plan. No differences were found in the reading achievement of students belonging to either plan; a negative difference in arithmetic achievement became smaller in the second year of homogeneous grouping (first year of the nongraded plan).

Another study which evaluates what could be considered a comprehensive nongraded program was conducted by Gumpper (1971). Test scores from children attending the first four years of school in a continuous progress program and in a modified self-contained graded program were compared. Some ability grouping was used for mathematics and reading classes at the same grade level in the control school. Students changed classes several times during each day, breaking some of the atmosphere of the self-contained classroom situation. In the experimental school, children were grouped homogeneously according to achievement for language arts and mathematics. Since the nongraded program was introduced, problems with ability grouping occurred and teachers had to deal with as many as three different levels of children at the same time.

The fact that the posttest was administered at the end of the first year of the nongraded program is Gumpper's main explanation for the positive results for first graders and the negative results for second, third, and fourth grade students. Rather than a true difference between graded and nongraded plans, the author believes that the lower achievement gains were more a function of problems of reorientation for older students in the continuous progress school.

Summary and discussion: Comprehensive nongraded programs. Findings from this group of studies are consistently in favor of the nongraded program. Almost all of its positive results are significant; not one study found significant differences in favor of the graded plan. The median effect size for the matched equivalent studies was + .34, and it was the same for all nine studies from which effect sizes could be estimated.

Among those studies that did not report any significant difference, three were conducted in university laboratory schools, and another three found equivalence in the first year of the program but started to see favorable changes in subsequent years. In the case of laboratory schools, control classes were similar to experimental ones or they appeared to be very high quality classes. Perhaps for these reasons, significant differences did not appear in those circumstances.

Across many studies, the duration of the program was correlated with higher positive differences. Other common characteristics in academically successful nongraded plans were subjects organized by levels, text written in accordance with those levels, and regrouping of students in multiage environments that allowed teachers to reduce the heterogeneity of their instructional groups.

Nongraded Programs Incorporating Individualized Instruction

Many studies of nongraded programs included indications that individualized instruction was an important part of the nongraded plan. These individualized approaches included one-to-one tutoring, programmed instruction, and learning activity packages. Two examples of the types of individualization adopted are as follows:

> Most students would be on contracts of work ... [which] might last from one to five days with the student coming to the teachers only in particular moments of difficulty. (Bowman, 1971, p. 46).

> The Individually Prescribed Instruction mathematics program ... was used in the model school. This individualized system of instruction provided each student with the opportunity to work on undeveloped skills, to obtain a diagnosis of new learnings, and to receive a prescription for the next sequence of material to be mastered. Math specialists, instructional aides, and volunteer aides were available to pupils on a one-to-one basis. (Jeffreys, 1970, p. 30)

All but one of the eleven studies of this type were conducted in a brief period, 1969-1973, with a median of 1971. This is considerably later than the time frame in which the studies summarized in Table 1 appeared. The median publication date for the Joplin-like

programs is 1962, and for the comprehensive (multiple subjects) programs, it is 1969. What this progression suggests is that individualized instruction increasingly became part of the nongraded elementary school in the late 1960's and early 1970's, at a time when individualization was gaining popularity in North American schools in general.

==========
Table 3 Here
==========

Table 3 summarizes the characteristics and findings of the 11 studies of nongraded programs including individualized instruction. Only one of these, conducted by Higgins (1980), randomly assigned students to nongraded or graded classes. Reading was the only subject of interest. The physical arrangements and instructional practices in both settings were essentially different. For the most part, instruction for children in the nongraded classrooms was individualized. The graded classes were grouped by ability and discussions took place in each group to check comprehension. The scores obtained by each group of students on the Metropolitan Reading Test did not show any significant difference (ES = +.02).

Sie (1969) studied pupils from second, third, and fourth grades who were in two schools, one with a traditional graded plan and the other with a nongraded plan. The students were matched according to their SAT scores. Both schools shared similar group instruction in the areas of work study skills, social studies, and science. The principal difference between them was that the nongraded school emphasized individualized instruction in reading and arithmetic, while the graded one used some form of within-class grouping for reading. Out of 24 gain scores computed for the SAT subtests, the nongraded students scored significantly better in one, arithmetic computation, while the graded students performed significantly better on paragraph meaning and language subtests. The overall effect size was near zero.

Jeffreys (1970) evaluated the academic achievement of children in a nongraded program characterized by an open space building design, team teaching, and individualized instruction, with that of children in a traditional graded plan. In the nongraded school, reading ability levels were used to group pupils for language arts, and skill levels were used to group them homogeneously in science. Students were grouped heterogeneously for social studies and health. In addition to spending more time in individualized and small group settings (math and spelling instruction followed an individualized system), nongraded students were found to initiate verbal interaction with teachers and to be involved in after-school activities a significantly greater number of times. However, no significant differences were found on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Another evaluation of a nongraded program operating in an open area and using team teaching was done by Wilt (1970). The author administered a teacher questionnaire to identify differences between both schools studied with respect to their internal structure, operating procedures, and teacher and student flexibility. Teachers in both schools supported the basic concept of individualized instruction, and it appears that those in the nongraded program used it somewhat more. There is no mention of its use in any specific subject; apparently it was used whenever the need arose. Consequently, criteria for grouping in the nongraded plan were more diverse (interest, academic achievement, student-teacher relationship) than in the graded program, where homogeneous grouping according to performance level prevailed. Despite the differences in vertical and horizontal organization, students' scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills did not differ significantly.

Among the matched studies lacking evidence of initial equality, Ward (1969) investigated the largest sample. He compared the academic achievement of children in four different schools, two of them implementing nongraded programs and two following graded plans. Results favored the experimental group in each of the 72 comparisons (although only 16 of these were statistically significant differences). The

author notes that the nongraded schools differed mainly in the larger amount of time used by their teachers and pupils in reading and arithmetic. The nongraded approach exhibited a more flexible use of time and provided "the kind of 'atmosphere' which is conducive to the individualization of instruction" (Ward, 1969, p. 168).

Burchyett (1972) found the largest differences in favor of the conventional school among the studies reporting use of individualized instruction (total ES = -. 08). None of these, however, were statistically significant for all of the three grades studied. He compared children attending a nongraded, multiaged, team-taught school with children attending self-contained classrooms in a graded organization. Unfortunately, the author does not specify which areas of instruction were approached on an individual basis, which were characterized by multiage grouping, and how organizational patterns differed in the schools under study.

One of the two studies in Table 3 reporting significant differences in favor of the nongraded program is a study by Bowman (1971). He compared pupils from first to sixth grade in a conventional graded school with students in a nongraded program from another school. The latter used individualized instruction, team teaching, flexible grouping, and learning centers. Individual work was emphasized in reading and mathematics: contracts for work on individualized units were agreed upon by teachers and pupils. Grouping across class and grade lines was the organizational arrangement for all other subjects, although curriculum changes were also undertaken for social studies, music, and art (science being an exception due to the lack of time to plan new units adaptable to a multiage situation). Strong positive effects on the academic achievement of intermediate students were found (ES = +.52), but the nongraded plan did not have similar results on the academic achievement of primary students (ES = +.06).

Killough (1971) reports another study with significant positive effects of a nongraded plan implemented in an open-space school. In this study, children benefited from being in a nongraded program from first grade through the junior high school years. After three years in the program, pupils had significantly higher cognitive achievement gains than control students. Details of the intervention were not described.

Walker (1973) also studied the long term effects of graded and nongraded primary programs. After rating the degree of nongradedness of each of the six programs he studied, his conclusions from comparing those that truly followed the nongraded principles with all the other plans resembled those of Bowman (1971). Scores began to differ significantly when children remained in a nongraded school after the primary unit. Walker found the greatest gap in academic achievement favoring these children at the fifth grade level. From his descriptions of the six programs studied, they differed mainly in the graded materials and terminology used in four schools and absent in two. Individualized instruction and grouping across grades was present in most schools, although with varying emphasis in reading and mathematics.

A sharper contrast between self-contained classes and nongradedness with individualized instruction is evident in a study by Case (1970). It compared three conventional elementary schools to one nongraded middle school. The elementary schools used ability grouping and concentrated primarily on the development of reading and mathematics skills (instruction was given to smaller homogeneous groups), while pupils in the nongraded program were encouraged to do independent study in these subjects. The study reports no significant differences between the gain scores of each group of students (total ES = +.09).

Givens (1972) evaluated fifth graders in two different schools. The demonstration school featured team-teaching, multiage grouping of pupils, an open-space concept, and individualization of instruction. Local universities contributed interns and student teachers to the schools' staff. No further description of the differences in instructional practices was provided. The standardized

test scores did not favor any of the schools (total ES = .00). An equal effect size was obtained in a small study conducted in the Snake River School District (1972).

Summary and discussion: Nongraded programs incorporating individualized instruction. Considered together, the results of research on these nongraded programs are remarkably consistent. No significant differences appear in most studies. A median effect size of essentially zero (ES = +.02) was found across nine studies from which effect sizes could be computed. These findings suggest that nongraded programs using individualized instruction are equivalent to graded plans in terms of academic achievement. As the nongraded plans became more complicated in their grouping arrangements, they apparently lost the comparative advantage Joplin-like or comprehensive nongraded programs had.

There is one interesting trend in the data on nongraded programs using individualized instruction: more positive effects were obtained with older than younger children. It may be that students need a certain level of maturity or self-organizational skills to profit from a continuous progress program which includes a good deal of independent work. Another indication of this is the observation that the longer the duration of the program, the better the results.

Individually Guided Education (IGE) Programs

Ten studies, most of which were done in the 1970's, met the inclusion criteria for this review. Since individualized instruction is a characteristic of IGE schools, comparisons between them and non-IGE schools cast light upon the effects of programs that stress individualized instruction.

Although the degree of implementation of IGE processes varied from one research setting to another, IGE concepts, components, and practices were clearly established by its developers at the University of Wisconsin (Klausmeier et al., 1971). As an ideal nongraded plan, the IGE program takes into account individual differences and uses specialized curriculum materials in reading, mathematics, and other subjects. But the IGE program is far more complicated than a usual nongraded program. Most reports do not provide any description of the type of intervention actually experienced by the experimental schools; it is implied that their organization follows the structure set in the implementation guidelines of 1971.

==========
Table 4 Here
==========

Schneiderhan (1973) did the only randomized study of IGE programs. She compared two experimental programs, Individually Guided Instruction (IGI) and Individually Guided Education (IGE), with a traditionally graded program. Fourth through sixth grade students from one school were randomly selected to follow an IGI or a traditional program. Their ITBS scores and the scores from a third group of students in a second school with an IGE program were used in the comparison. Both IGE and IGI programs were characterized by nongradedness, team teaching, multiage grouping, differentiated staffing, and open-space environments. It can be inferred from the short descriptions provided that the only difference between them is the additional components an IGE program has: an Instructional Improvement Committee and a Systemwide Program Committee.

There were no consistent significant differences found between the academic achievement of any of the three groups. It is possible that only one year in the IGI program after several years (at least three) in the conventional graded plan could not dramatically affect children's performance.

Price (1977), in the largest matched study lacking evidence of initial comparability, started by measuring the level of implementation of the 35 processes emphasized in IGE schools. Then the author compared students' academic achievement in schools that were high implementers of the IGE philosophy with students' achievement in schools that were low implementers. Schools identified as high implementers,

compared to low implementers, were associated with either higher or comparable pupil outcomes. Significant differences were found for reading achievement, but these cannot be correlated with specific classroom practices and organization since no description of them was provided. The findings of this study are biased by the fact that high implementers are probably better schools than low implementers, and this is likely to be related to student achievement differences.

Five other studies showed no consistent differences among the schools compared. Except for Kuhlman's, none of them carefully describe the organizational arrangements adopted by each program. Biernacki (1976) evaluated an IGE multiunit program implemented by an inner-city elementary school. The academic achievement of selected students attending grades 3 through 6 from the multiunit school and from a self-contained graded school was compared, and no significant differences were found (total ES = +.17). Klaus (1981) tried not only to compare achievement of students in IGE and non IGE schools, but to determine the effect the number of years spent by a student in each program had on his or her performance. His sample consisted of students who attended the same elementary schools and remained in the system through eleventh grade. The IGE program ended at the sixth grade level. Overall student change scores from fourth to sixth grade showed no significant effects of the program (total ES = +.05), and no significant differences were found in the achievement of eleventh grade students. This study reports larger differences favoring the scores of fourth graders in IGE schools. These differences become smaller in subsequent grades.

In the only study that favors non-IGE schools, Flowers (1977) studied students' academic achievement in open space IGE schools and in traditional schools. He found no significant differences between their standardized test scores (total ES = -.25). Also, Henn's (1974) comparison of IGE and non-IGE programs did not yield significant differences in the academic achievement of students in either program (total ES = +.03).

Kuhlman (1985) compared four types of school organization: conventional graded schools, traditional alternative schools (also graded), open alternative schools, and IGE schools. From the author's descriptions it is clear that the last two types of schools emphasized individualized instruction and used a nongraded approach. In regression analyses, the variable for school organization did not obtain a significant coefficient.

Three other studies, besides the one conducted by Price, found significant differences in favor of IGE schools. Bradford (1972) studied an IGE school characterized by multilevel programs for reading, mathematics, and spelling, by an effective use of a multimedia approach and community resources for classroom enrichment, and by experiences with dramatization as a classroom technique. Preassessment tools were used to assemble students in small groups, independent study, or in a one-to-one relationship. Students' gains were close to statistical significance in reading, and significantly greater in mathematics in the IGE school than in self-contained classrooms.

Burtley's (1974) comparison of IGE and traditional programs favored the former with respect to academic achievement (total ES = +.48). The author reports substantial differences in teachers' behavior and in instructional programs between the two plans compared. Teachers in the IGE school assumed more professional responsibilities and engaged in team teaching. Children in this school were exposed to several instructional modes: large or small multiage groups, one-to-one tutoring, independent study, and pairing. Another important difference was that an effort was made to avoid teaching subjects in isolation from each other; consequently, skills were constantly reinforced.

Finally, a small study done by Soumokil (1977) reported the largest total effect size (+ .80). As in the Price study, the research started by assessing the differences between an IGE elementary program in one school with a standard program in another. After confirming the character of each school's

label, the author proceeded to compare students' standardized test scores. IGE students scored significantly higher.

Summary and discussion: IGE programs. Overall, research findings on IGE schools resemble results obtained by other studies on nongraded programs incorporating individualized instruction (Table 3). The median effect size across six studies from which effect sizes could be computed was near zero (ES = +.11). Nevertheless, four studies reported significant differences in favor of IGE schools and they all are evaluations of schools which clearly differ from each other. It seems that schools which are closer to a full implementation of IGE concepts supply students with a wider range of instructional possibilities for their specific needs: small groups, one-to-one tutoring, or independent work. This finding supports the argument that selective use of individualized instruction can yield positive results for children's academic performance.

Studies Lacking an Explicit Description of the Nongraded Program

The last group of studies, summarized in Table 5, includes six studies dated in the 1960's and six in the 1970's, all of which lack an explicit description of the type of intervention applied to experimental schools and the characteristics of control schools. Two doubts confront any reader of these reports: to what extent is the nongraded label a good description of practices in the experimental situations, and what characteristics do control schools have that really make them fit a conventional description. The value of these studies is perhaps in putting to rest the idea that simply giving a school an innovative label, in this case "nongraded," will have some effect on student learning. These studies are included for the sake of completeness, but little can be learned from them.

==========
Table 5 Here
==========

In the largest matched-equivalent study, Hickey (1962) found that students in nongraded primaries in seven Catholic schools learned significantly more after three years than did students in similar graded schools (total ES = + .46).

Among all other studies, only the smallest (Engel and Cooper, 1971) reported positive significant differences (total ES = + 1.10). This study also differs from all others in its assurance that the schools compared belong to extremes in an index of nongradedness.

Two medium-sized matched studies which lacked evidence of initial equality reported significant difference in favor of graded schools. Vogel and Bowers (1972) conducted a one-year study of students in kindergarten through sixth grade. Pupils in graded schools scored higher on the standardized test (SAT), but significantly lower on measures of conceptual maturity (according to the Harris Draw-A-Person Test).

The second study that found significantly higher achievement in graded schools was also one of the lowest in methodological quality. Carbone (1961) compared the achievement of students in traditional graded schools to pupils' outcomes in schools mentioned by Goodlad and Anderson (1959) as nongraded, controlling for IQ scores. The students involved were in grades four, five, and six, thus they were one, two, or three years (respectively) beyond their experience in the nongraded primary. Further, there were substantial IQ differences between the two sets of students, and teacher questionnaires indicated very few differences between the two sets of teachers in reported classroom practices.

Summary and discussion: Programs not adequately described. This is the only group of research studies in which a trend is not evident. The median effect size is near zero (ES = +.02), but two studies found significantly positive effects and two significantly negative ones. The most serious limitation of these studies is the lack of descriptions that could help to interpret the findings. A closer look at the four studies

that present significant differences makes the argument in favor of the nongraded programs more convincing. Both positive studies had greater methodological quality: both had evidence of initial equality (students were matched on IQ), and Engel and Cooper even tested the validity of schools' labels. In contrast, each of the negative studies has some serious problems: inconsistency of findings or flaws in the experimental setting.

Interactions With Study Features

In addition to differentiating results according to categories of programs, assessments were made of the interaction of nongraded vs. graded organization with other features of the studies. One finding, which buttresses the main conclusions of this review, was that program effects for the Joplin-like and comprehensive models were particularly strong and consistent in the higher-quality studies, the randomized and matched-equivalent experiments. However, there were no consistent patterns with respect to effects at different grade levels (1-3 vs. 4-6) or subjects (reading, math, or language arts). Longer implementations (more than one year) were only inconsistently associated with larger effects.

Program effects declined according to year of publication of the studies, but this is of course confounded with program types; past studies of the Joplin-like and comprehensive models without individualization were reported in the 1960's, while most studies of nongraded programs emphasizing individualization, including studies of IGE, were reported in the 1970's.

Does Nongrading Accelerate or Decelerate Student Progress?

One of the principal rationales for nongrading is that it allows students to spend more time in the grades involved, if necessary, until they can reach a high level of performance, or to spend less time if they are able to go more quickly than other students. Surprisingly, only one study ever actually assessed the degree to which nongraded students took non-normative amounts of time to complete the primary or elementary grades. This was a study by McLoughlin (1970), which compared students in graded and ungraded primary programs in eight New York State school districts.

The nongraded programs used flexible cross-class and cross-age grouping, teaching to homogeneous groups and continuous progress curricula, and would therefore probably fall into the "comprehensive" category defined earlier. The comparisons were made in 1964-65 and again in 1965-66. In 1964-65, an average of 4.4% of students took an extra year to complete the primary grades in the nongraded schools, 4.6% in the graded ones. In 1965-66, 2.9% of nongraded students took an extra year, while 7.3% of graded students had been retained. No students were accelerated in either type of program in 1964-65, and one tenth of one percent were accelerated in the nongraded schools in 1965-66.

Put another way, 95.6% of the nongraded students made normative progress through the primary grades in 1964-65, and 97.0% in 1965-66. What this means is that, at least in the time and places studied by McLoughlin, nongrading was not being used as a means of altering the amount of time students spent in the primary grades. On the contrary, in 1965-66 more students were "decelerated" by retention in the graded schools than the number that took the opportunity to spend more time in the primary grades offered by the nongraded structure.

McLoughlin (1970) also checked to see whether schools that had been implementing the nongraded plan over a longer period had more students who made non-normative progress than newer nongraded programs. There was a slight (nonsignificant) trend, but it was in the opposite direction. First-year

nongraded programs had somewhat more students making non-normative progress than did schools which had implemented nongrading for two to seven years.

If McLoughlin's findings apply to other nongraded programs, this has important methodological and substantive consequences. Methodologically, there is a concern in studies of nongrading that if nongraded students take more time to complete the primary grades, their test scores will be artificially increased. That is, if "third year" students in a nongraded school were older on average than third graders in a graded school, this could explain any test-score advantage of the nongraded programs. It would be important to know this is not the case.

Substantively, McLoughlin's findings may be seen as questioning one assumption of many advocates of nongrading, who often paint a picture of the low achieving child proceeding happily and successfully through the grades, never particularly aware that he or she is taking four years to accomplish what his or her classmates are completing in three. Yet students (and, more particularly, their parents) can count, and they know who their classmates were when they entered school. The pressures to have students make normative progress may be as strong in nongraded as in graded programs.

Yet the main thrust of Goodlad and Anderson's rationale is not affected by McLoughlin's findings. It is still plausible that deceleration in continuous-progress curriculum is preferable to retention. Further, in a flexible nongraded program it may be that students who would otherwise fall behind can be identified and given extra assistance and then catch up with their peers. The nongraded plan might be seen not as a way to give low achievers *more* time, but rather as a way to use time and other resources more flexibly. A student who is not reading at the end of first grade might well be reading at the end of second if he or she receives extra help (and does not suffer the humiliation of repeating first grade).

Discussion

As the nongraded elementary plan re-appears in schools of the 1990's, it is important to learn about the history of this movement of thirty years ago. Most importantly, we need to understand the achievement effects of nongraded organization, and to understand the conditions under which achievement was or was not enhanced by this innovation.

A review of research on the nongraded elementary school is particularly needed today because there was little consensus on its effects in its own time. Only two reviews examined portions of the literature, and they came to opposite conclusions. Pavan (1973, 1977) concluded that the evidence favored the nongraded primary, while McLoughlin (1967) stated that most research showed no differences between graded and nongraded plans.
Using the review methods they applied, the evidence presented here from a much larger set of studies could be interpreted as confirming both Pavan's and McLoughlin's contradictory conclusions.

==========
Table 6 Here
==========

Table 6 summarizes the outcomes of the 57 studies which met the inclusion standards. Looking only at the "box score" of significant and non-significant positive and negative findings, the results can be read to support either McLoughlin's (1967) negative conclusion or Pavan's (1977) positive one. McLoughlin argued that since non-significant findings outnumbered significant positive ones, the effects of the nongraded primary were equivocal. Twenty-five years later, the proportions of significantly positive findings are like those he reported; only twenty of the 57 studies were significantly positive. Pavan

(1973, 1977) came to the opposite conclusion, noting that significant positive findings far outnumbered significant negative ones. This is also true in the present review; only three studies significantly favored graded programs, while twenty favored nongraded ones.

However, the conclusions of the present review conform to neither McLoughlin's nor Pavan's conclusions. Instead, the evidence presented here supports a conclusion that the effects of nongraded programs depend on the type of program being implemented. Using median effect sizes rather than box scores, it is clear that the effects of nongraded organization are strongest when the program focuses on the "vertical organization" of the school, when nongrading is used as a grouping strategy but not as a framework for individualized instruction.

Four categories of nongraded programs were examined, plus one group of studies in which the nature of the nongraded program could not be determined. Studies in two of these categories clearly supported the nongraded plans. These are the Joplin-like programs, in which students are grouped across age lines in just one subject (usually reading), and the comprehensive programs, which involve cross age grouping in many subjects but still rely on teacher-directed instruction. Not only were median effect sizes for studies in these categories clearly positive (+.46 for Joplin-like programs, +.34 for comprehensive), but the best-designed evaluations are the ones most likely to show the positive effects.

In contrast, nongraded programs which incorporated a great deal of individualized instruction (and correspondingly less teacher-directed instruction), including Individually Guided Instruction (IGE), were less consistently associated with achievement gain. This is not to say that these approaches reduce student achievement; rather, their effects are very inconsistent, generally neither helping nor hurting student achievement, with more studies finding positive than negative effects (especially in the case of IGE). Poorly described nongraded programs also had median effects very near zero, perhaps because experimental and control groups may not have differed in anything essential except for label.

What accounts for the relatively consistent positive effects of the Joplin-like and comprehensive nongraded plans and the less consistent effects of programs incorporating individualization? Recent developments in educational research suggest some possibilities.

The most obvious reason that incorporating a great deal of individualization might have reduced the effectiveness of the nongraded elementary school is suggested by research on individualized instruction itself, which has generally failed to support this innovation (see, for example, Horak, 1981; Miller, 1981; Bangert, Kulik, & Kulik, 1983; Rothrock, 1982). Correlational evidence from process-product studies of more and less effective teachers has consistently found that student learning is enhanced by direct instruction from teachers, as contrasted with extensive reliance on individualization, seatwork, and written materials to convey content to students (see Brophy & Good, 1986).

Further, to the degree that the nongraded elementary school came to resemble the open school, the research finding few achievement benefits of this approach takes on increased relevance (e.g., Giaconia & Hedges, 1982).

In its simplest forms, the nongraded elementary school has many likely benefits. By grouping students across age lines, it may allow teachers to reduce the number of within-class reading and math groups they teach at any given time, thereby reducing the need for independent seatwork and follow-up. In fact, in several of the evaluations of Joplin-like programs, it was noted that cross-age groupings made within-class groupings (i.e., reading groups) unnecessary, so teachers could spend the class period teaching the entire class, with no need for seatwork unless they saw a specific need for it.

Another factor in the success of simple nongraded plans is the likelihood that flexible cross-age grouping allows teachers to fully accommodate instruction to the needs of each

child in a particular subject while still delivering instruction to groups. Goodlad and Anderson's (1959, 1963) critique of traditional ability grouping is that it does not truly reduce heterogeneity in the specific skill being taught. Grouping students within classes or within grades (in all but the largest elementary schools) does not provide enough opportunity to have group instruction closely tailored to student needs. Flexible cross-age grouping does provide such an opportunity, so the instructional costs of grouping (in terms of disruption, movement, and stigma for children in low groups) can perhaps be outweighed by the greater opportunity to adapt instruction to the precise needs of students and to continue to adapt to students' needs by examining and changing groupings at frequent intervals (see Slavin, 1987).

If the effectiveness of nongraded organization is due to increased direct instruction delivered at each student's precise instructional level, then it is easy to see how a move to greater individualization would undermine these effects. Individualized instruction, learning stations, learning activity packets, and other individualized or small group activities reduce direct instruction time with little corresponding increase in appropriateness of instruction to individual needs (in comparison to the simpler cross-age grouping plans).

It is difficult to assess the impact of one of the key rationales given for the nongraded plan throughout its history, the opportunity to allow at-risk students to take as much time as they need to complete the primary or elementary grades without the use of retention. An early study by McLoughlin (1970) found that self-described nongraded programs did not generally take advantage of the opportunity to let low achievers take more time, but we do not know if McLoughlin's findings would apply to most nongraded programs implemented now or in the past. Clearly, however, the effectiveness of the simpler nongraded programs does not depend on the opportunity to accelerate or decelerate student progress, since most studies found positive effects in the first year of implementation, before any acceleration or deceleration could take place.

This discussion is completely speculative. There is much more we would have liked to know about how nongraded programs were actually implemented in the '50's, '60's, and '70's. The return of the nongraded idea in the 1990's may, however, allow us to answer many questions. We need not only assessments of current forms of nongrading, but also component analyses to understand which elements of nongrading account for the program's effects, and studies combining qualitative and quantitative methods to understand what really changes in nongraded schools and what differences these changes make in student achievement.

Does Earlier Research on the Nongraded Elementary School Have Relevance Today?

How much relevance does research on the nongraded elementary school have to education today?

Many of the problems that the nongraded elementary school was designed to solve are still with us today, and the re-emergence of nongraded programs appears to be due in large part to concern about these problems, especially the tension between retention and social promotion and rejection of traditional forms of ability grouping.

Yet there are also many differences between education today and that of thirty years ago. The general perception that both individualized instruction (e.g., Bangert et al., 1983; Horak, 1981) and the open classroom (e.g., Giaconia & Hedges, 1982) failed in their attempt to increase student achievement means that it is unlikely that the nongraded elementary schools of the 1990's will, like those of the early 1970's, embrace these methods. As a result, it is more likely the nongraded programs of the 1990's will resemble the simpler forms found in this review to be instructionally effective.

Other developments will certainly influence the forms taken by the nongraded programs, their effects on achievement, and their ultimate impact on educational practice. The movement toward "developmentally appropriate" early childhood education

and its association with nongrading mean that the nongraded primary school of the 1990's will often incorporate four- and five-year-olds (earlier forms rarely did so), and that instruction in nongraded primary programs will probably be more integrated and thematic, and less academically structured or hierarchical, than in other schools. As in the early 1970's the effectiveness of the nongraded *school organization* plan may become confounded with innovative *instructional* methods. Whether these instructional methods will have positive or negative effects on ultimate achievement is currently unknown.

The ultimate impact of the nongraded ideal will also have much to do with rapidly unfolding changes in assessment and accountability. One reason for the increase in retention, pre-first, and other extra-year programs in the late 1970's and early 1980's was greatly increased accountability pressures in U.S. schools. Retaining more students has a strong (though short-lived) positive impact on achievement test scores reported by grade (not age), because the children taking the tests are older (see Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1991; Slavin & Madden, 1991).

There is currently widespread concern about high retention rates (Shepard & Smith, 1989), yet returning to social promotion would greatly reduce test scores in high-retention districts. If the nongraded elementary school emerges as a means of giving low achievers more time in the elementary grades, it may be favored by the current policies of reporting test scores by grade (for the same reasons that they favor retention). On the other hand, if high-stakes accountability systems begin to report achievement by *age* (as does, for example, he National Assessment of Educational Progress), this advantage may not become a factor.

Clearly, there is a need for much more research on the nongraded elementary school as it is being implemented today. Because of scientific conventions of the time, most of the earlier research reviewed here was strong in experimental design (most studies used random assignment or careful matching of experimental and control groups) but weak in description of the independent variable, the characteristics of the nongraded and graded schools. Research done today must be strong on both dimensions. Goodlad and Anderson (1963) emphasize that the nongraded plan only addresses vertical organization, not instruction. Yet, as we have seen in this review, differences in instructional methods between nongraded and graded schools may account for differences (or non-differences) in outcomes.

Research on the nongraded elementary school offers a fascinating glimpse into the history and ultimate fate of a compelling innovation. The return of this idea after nearly twenty years of dormancy is fascinating as well. This review concludes that the evidence from the first cycle of research on the nongraded elementary school supports use of simpler forms of the model and certainly supports the need and potential fruitfulness of further experimentation. Yet there is a cautionary note in this tale as well. Good ideas can be undermined by complexification over time. We need a constant cycle of experimentation, research, evaluation, revision, and continued experimentation to build compelling ideas into comprehensive, effective plans for school organization and instruction.

References

Aigner, B.W. (1961). *A statistical analysis of achievement differences of children in a nongraded primary program and traditional classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College.

Allington, R.L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (1991). *Unintended effects of educational reform in New York State.* Submitted for publication.

Bangert, R., Kulik, J., & Kulik, C. (1983). Individualized systems of instruction in secondary schools. *Review of Educational Research, 53,* 143-158.

Barr, R. (1990). The social organization of literacy instruction. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference.* Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Biernacki, G.J. (1976). *An evaluation of an IGE/MUS-E inner-city elementary school based on selected criteria.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo.

Bockrath, S.M.B. (1958). *An evaluation of the ungraded primary as an organizational device for improving learning in Saint Louis Archdiocesan Schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University.

Bowman, B.L. (1971). *A comparison of pupil achievement and attitude in a graded school with pupil achievement and attitude in a nongraded school 1968-69.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Bradford, E.F. (1972). *A comparison of two methods of teaching in the elementary school as related to achievement in reading, mathematics, and self-concept of children.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Brody, E.B. (1970). Achievement of first- and second-year pupils in graded and nongraded classrooms. *Elementary School Journal, 70,* 391-394.

Buffie, E.G.W. (1962). *A comparison of mental health and academic achievement: The nongraded school vs. the graded school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Burchyett, J.A. (1972). *A comparison of the effects of non-graded, multi-age, team-teaching vs. the modified self-contained classroom at the elementary school level.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Burtley, N. (1974). *A comparison of teacher characteristics and student achievement in individually guided education (IGE) and traditional inner city elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Carbone, R.F. (1961). *A comparison of graded and non-graded elementary schools.* Study of the Education of American Teachers, 82- 88.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Case, D.A. (1970). *A comparative study of fifth graders in a new middle school with fifth graders in elementary self contained classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida.

Chastain, C.S. (1961). *An experimental study of the gains in achievement in arithmetic and reading made by the pupils in the intermediate grades in the Rangely, Colorado, Elementary School platoons, and in nongraded classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College.

Enevoldsen, C.L. (1961). *An evaluation of the ungraded primary program in selected schools in the Lincoln, Nebraska, Public School system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Engel, B.M., Cooper, M. (1971). Academic achievement and nongradedness. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 40,* 24-26.

Flowers, J.R. (1977). A *comparative study of students in open space individually guided education (IGE) and traditional schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

Floyd, C. (1954). Meeting children's reading needs in the middle grades: A preliminary report. *Elementary School Journal, 55,* 99-103.

Giaconia, R.M., & Hedges, L.V. (1982). Identifying features of open education. *Review of Educational Research, 52,* 579-602.

Givens, H. Jr. (1972). *A comparative study of achievement and attitudinal characteristics of black and white intermediate pupils in individualized, multigrade and self-contained instructional programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University.

Glass, G.V., McGaw, B., Smith, M.L. (1981). *Meta-analysis in Social Research.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Goodlad, J.I., Anderson, R.H. (1959). *The nongraded elementary school.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Goodlad, J.I., & Anderson, R.H. (1963). *The nongraded elementary school* (rev. ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Goodlad, J.I., Anderson, R.H. (1987). *The nongraded elementary school* (reprinted edition). New York: Teachers College Press.

Guarino, A.R. (1982). *An investigation of achievement, self-concept, and school related anxiety in graded and nongraded elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The State University of New Jersey at Rutgers.

Gumpper, D.C., Meyer, J.H., Kaufman, J.J. (1971). *Nongraded elementary education: individualized learning- teacher leadership- student responsibility.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Institute for Research on Human Resources.

Halliwell, J.W. (1963). A Comparison of Pupil Achievement in Graded and Nongraded Primary Classrooms. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 32,* 59-64.

Hart, R.H. (1962). The nongraded primary school and arithmetic. *The Arithmetic Teacher, 9*, 130-133.

Heathers, G. (1967). *Organizing schools through the dual progress plan.* Danville, IL: Interstate.

Henn, D.C. (1974). *A comparative analysis of language arts and mathematics achievement in selected IGE/MUS-E and non-IGE/MUS-E programs in Ohio.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Herrington, A.F. (1973). *Perceived attitudes and academic achievement of reported graded and nongraded sixth-year students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami.

Hickey, S.M.P. (1962). *An analysis and evaluation of the ungraded primary program in the diocese of Pittsburgh.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Higgins, J.J. (1980). *A comparative study between the reading achievement levels of students in a combination/ungraded class and students in a graded class.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Hillson, M., Jones J.C., Moore, J.W. (1967). A comparison of pupil achievement after one and one-half and three years in a nongraded program. *The Journal of Educational Research, 61*, 75-77.

Hopkins, K.D., Oldridge, O.A., Williamson, M.L. (1965). An empirical comparison of pupil achievement and other variables in graded and ungraded classes. *American Educational Research Journal, 2*, 207-215.

Horak, V.M. (1981). A meta-analysis of research findings on individualized instruction in mathematics. *Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 249-253.

Ingram, V. (1960). Flint evaluates its primary cycle. *Elementary School Journal, 61*, 76-80.

Jacquette, F.C. (1959). *A five year study to determine the effects of the ungraded classroom organization on reading achievement in Grand Junction, Colorado.* Unpublished Field Study, Colorado State College.

Jeffreys, J.S. (1970). *An investigation of the effects of innovative educational practices on pupil-centeredness of observed behaviors and on learner outcome variables.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Karweit, N.L. (1989). Effective kindergarten programs and practices for students at risk. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & N.A. Madden (Eds.), *Effective programs for students at risk. (pp.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.*

Karweit, N.L. (in press a). Effects of early prevention and preschool programs on early reading success. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & B.A. Wasik, (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Karweit, N.L. (in press b). A year to grow: Denial of access or needed breathing space? In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & B.A. Wasik, (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hart, R.H. (1962). The nongraded primary school and arithmetic. *The Arithmetic Teacher, 9,* 130-133.

Heathers, G. (1967). *Organizing schools through the dual progress plan.* Danville, IL: Interstate.

Henn, D.C. (1974). *A comparative analysis of language arts and mathematics achievement in selected IGE/MUS-E and non-IGE/MUS-E programs in Ohio.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Herrington, A.F. (1973). *Perceived attitudes and academic achievement of reported graded and nongraded sixth-year students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami.

Hickey, S.M.P. (1962). *An analysis and evaluation of the ungraded primary program in the diocese of Pittsburgh.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Higgins, J.J. (1980). *A comparative study between the reading achievement levels of students in a combination/ungraded class and students in a graded class.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Hillson, M., Jones J.C., Moore, J.W. (1967). A comparison of pupil achievement after one and one-half and three years in a nongraded program. *The Journal of Educational Research, 61,* 75-77.

Hopkins, K.D., Oldridge, O.A., Williamson, M.L. (1965). An empirical comparison of pupil achievement and other variables in graded and ungraded classes. *American Educational Research Journal, 2,* 207-215.

Horak, V.M. (1981). A meta-analysis of research findings on individualized instruction in mathematics. *Journal of Educational Research, 74,* 249-253.

Ingram, V. (1960). Flint evaluates its primary cycle. *Elementary School Journal, 61,* 76-80.

Jacquette, F.C. (1959). *A five year study to determine the effects of the ungraded classroom organization on reading achievement in Grand Junction, Colorado.* Unpublished Field Study, Colorado State College.

Jeffreys, J.S. (1970). *An investigation of the effects of innovative educational practices on pupil-centeredness of observed behaviors and on learner outcome variables.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Karweit, N.L. (1989). Effective kindergarten programs and practices for students at risk. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & N.A. Madden (Eds.), *Effective programs for students at risk. (pp.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.*

Karweit, N.L. (in press a). Effects of early prevention and preschool programs on early reading success. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & B.A. Wasik, (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Karweit, N.L. (in press b). A year to grow: Denial of access or needed breathing space? In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & B.A. Wasik, (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Karweit, N.L., & Wasik, B.A. (in press). Extra-year kindergarten programs and transitional first grades. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, & B.A. Wasik, (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies.*

Killough, C.K. *An analysis of the longitudinal effects that a nongraded elementary program, conducted in an open-space school, had on the cognitive achievement of pupils.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

Kierstead, R. (1963). A comparison and evaluation of two methods of organization for the teaching of reading. *The Journal of Educational Research, 56*, 317-321.

Klaus, W.D. (1981). *A comparison of student achievement in individually guided education programs and non-individually guided education elementary school programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Klausmeier, H.J., Quilling, M.R., Sorenson, J.S., Way, R.S., and Glasrud, G.R. (1971). *Individually guided education and the multiunit elementary school: Guidelines for implementation.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Research & Development Center for Cognitive Learning.

Klausmeier, H.J., Rossmiller, R.A., Saily, M. (Eds.) (1977). *Individually Guided Elementary Education: Concepts and Practices.* New York: Academic Press.

Kuhlman, C.L. (1985). *A study of the relationship between organizational characteristics of elementary schools, student characteristics, and elementary competency test results .* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

Lair, D.P. (1975). *The effects of graded and nongraded schools on student growth.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Baylor University.

Lawson, R.E. (1973). *A comparison of the development of self-concept and achievement in reading of students in the first, third, and fifth year of attendance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University.

Levine, D.U., & Eubanks, E.E. (1986-87). *Achievement improvement and non-improvement at concentrated poverty schools in big cities.* Metropolitan Education, *3*, 92-107.

Lorton, L. (1973). *Reorganizing for learning at McKinley School: An experiment in multi-unit instruction.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Machiele, R.B. (1965). A preliminary evaluation of the non-graded primary at Leal School, Urbana. *Illinois School Research, 1*, 20-24.

Maresh, R.T. (1971). *An analysis of the effects of vertical grade groups on reading achievement and attitudes in elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota.

McLoughlin, W.P. (1967). *The nongraded school: A critical assessment.* New York: State Education Department.

McLoughlin, W.P. (1970). Continuous pupil progress in the non-graded school: Hope or hoax? *Elementary School Journal*, 90-96.

McPartland, J.M., Coldiron, J.R., & Braddock, J.H. (1987). *School structures and classroom practices in elementary, middle, and secondary schools*, (Tech. Rep. No. 14). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Miller, R.L. (1976). Individualized instruction in mathematics: A review of research. *The Mathematics Teacher, 69*, 345-351.

Moore, D.I. (1963). *Pupil achievement and grouping practices in graded and ungraded primary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Morris, V.R. (1968). *An evaluation of pupil achievement in a nongraded primary plan after three, and also five years of instruction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University.

Muck, R.E.S. (1966). *The effect of classroom organization on academic achievement in graded and nongraded classes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Mycock, M.A. (1966). *A comparison of vertical grouping and horizontal grouping in the infant school*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Manchester.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (1989). *Appropriate education in the primary grades*. Washington, DC: Author.

Otto, H.J. (1969). *Nongradedness: An elementary school evaluation*. Austin: University of Texas.

Pavan, B.N. (1972). *Moving elementary schools toward nongradedness: Commitment, assessment, and tactics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

Pavan, B.N. (1973). Good news: Research on the nongraded elementary school. *Elementary School Journal*, 333-342.

Pavan, B.N. (1977). The nongraded elementary school: Research on academic and mental health. *Texas Tech Journal of Education, 4*, 91-107.

Perrin, J.D. (1969). *A statistical and time change analysis of achievement differences of children in a nongraded and a graded program in selected schools in the Little Rock Public Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas.

Price, D.A. (1977). *The effects of individually guided education (IGE) processes on achievement and attitudes of elementary school students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Ramayya, D.P. (1972). *Achievement skills, personality variables, and classroom climate in graded and nongraded elementary schools*. Nova Scotia: Dartmouth Public Schools.

Reichardt, C.S. (1979). The statistical analysis of data from nonequivalent group designs. In T.C. Cook & D.T. Campbell, *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings* (pp. 147-205). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Reid, B.C. (1973). *A comparative analysis of a nongraded and graded primary program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama.

Remacle, L.F. (1970). *A comparative study of the differences in attitudes, self-concept, and achievement of children in graded and nongraded elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.

Ross, G.A. (1967). *A comparative study of pupil progress in ungraded and graded primary programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Rothrock, D. (1982). The rise and decline of individualized instruction. *Educational Leadership, 39*, 528-531.

Schneiderhan, R.M. (1973). *A comparison of an individually guided education (IGE) program, an individually guided instruction (IGI) program, and a traditional elementary educational program at the intermediate level.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Shepard, L.A. & Smith, M.L. (Eds.) (1989). *Flunking grades: Research and policies on retention.* New York: Falmer.

Sie, M.S. (1969). *Pupil achievement in an experimental nongraded elementary school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Skapski, M.K. (1960). Ungraded primary reading program: An objective evaluation. *Elementary School Journal, 61*, 41-45.

Slavin, R.E. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. *Educational Researcher*, 15 (9), 5-11.

Slavin, R.E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 293-336.

Slavin, R.E. (1990). Ability grouping and student achievement in secondary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 60*, 471-499.

Slavin, R.E. & Madden, N.A. (1991). Modifying Chapter 1 program improvement guidelines to reward appropriate practices. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13*, 369-379.

Snake River School District. (1972). *Curriculum change through nongraded individualization.* Blackfoot: School District 52.

Soumokil, P.O. (1977). *Comparison of cognitive and affective dimensions of individually guided education (IGE) and standard elementary school programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Vogel, F.S., Bowers, N.D. (1972). Pupil behavior in a multiage nongraded school. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 41*, 78-86.

Walker, W.E. (1973). *Long term effects of graded and nongraded primary programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Ward, D.N. (1969). *An evaluation of a nongraded school program in grades one and two.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Williams, W. (1966). Academic achievement in a graded school and in a non-graded school. *Elementary School Journal*, 135-139.

Willis, S. (1991). Breaking down grade barriers: Interest in nongraded classrooms on the rise. *ASCD Update, 33* (3), 1, 4.

Wilt, H.J. (1970). *A comparison of student attitudes toward school, academic achievement, internal structures and procedures: The nongraded school vs. the graded school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri.

Zerby, J.R. (1960). *A comparison of academic achievement and social adjustment of primary school children in the graded and nongraded school programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Appendix

Abbreviations used in the tables

+	Results clearly favor nongraded programs
(+)	Results generally favor nongraded programs
0	No trend in results
(-)	Results generally favor graded programs
-	Results clearly favor graded programs
AG	Ability Grouping
CAT	California Achievement Test
CRT	California Reading Test
CTBS	Canadian Test of Basic Skills
CLTBS	California Test of Basic Skills
DLRT	Durrell Listening-Reading Test
GPRT	Gates Primary Reading Test
IGE	Individually Guided Education
IGI	Individually Guided Instruction
ITBS	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
G	Graded Program
GE	Grade Equivalent
KCT	Kansas Competency Test
LCRT	Lee Clark Reading Test
MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
MRT	Metropolitan Reading Test
NARA	Neale Analysis for Reading Ability

NG	Nongraded Program
OS	Open-area School
OST	Ohio Survey Test
PT	Piaget-type Test
SAT	Stanford Achievement Test
SRAAS	Science Research Associates Achievement Series
STEP	Sequential Test of Educational Programs

Table 1: Nongraded Programs Involving Only One Subject (Joplin-like Programs)

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Randomized Studies									
Hillson, Jones, Moore, and Van Devender (1967)	2-3	Shamokin, Pennsylvania	52 (26 NG, 26 G) (1 school)	1.5 yrs. 3 yrs. (followup)	Students and teachers randomly assigned to NG/Joplin or heterogeneous graded classes for reading only.	SAT, LCRT[a]		Rdg. (1.5 yrs.) +.72 * Rdg. (3 yrs.) +.33	+.33
Matched Studies with Evidence of Initial Equality									
Halliwell (1963)	1-3	New Jersey	295 (146 NG, 149 G) (1 school)	1 yr.	Compared NG/Joplin in reading and spelling to previous yr. heterogeneous grouping in the graded program. Students had comparable IQ at the beginning of the study.	CAT (gr. 1), MAT (gr. 2-3)		Rdg. +.53 *	+.53 *
Skapski (1960)	3	Burlington, Vermont	110 (3 schools)	3 yrs.	Students matched on IQ. Compared NG/Joplin in reading only to heterogeneous grouping in a graded program.	SAT	Su. +.91 Hi. +.48 Av. +.52	Rdg. +.57 **	+.57 **
Hart (1962)	4	Hillsboro, Oregon	100 (50 NG, 50 G) (1 school)	3 yrs.	Students matched on sex, mental maturity, age, and SES. Compared NG/Joplin in arithmetic only to heterogeneous grouping in a graded program.	CAT		Math +.46 *	+.46*
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Bockrath (1958)	4	Archdiocese of St. Louis	(1974 NG, 1622 G) (50 schools)	3 yrs.	Comparison between 1956 students' reading achievement with 1953 students' scores. IQ used to adjust score medians. Stratified sample by size and location of schools.	CAT	Hi. + Lo. +	Rdg. +.51 **	+.51 **

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Jacquette (1959)	1-6	Grand Junction, Colorado	3517 (1554 NG, 1963 G) (4 schools)	5 yrs.	Schools matched on rdg. achievement and IQ. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	CAT, GPRT		Rdg. +.03	+.03
Moore (1963)	1-2	Wayne, Michigan	621 (292 NG, 329 G) (4 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on SES and curriculum. Change scores used to control pretest achievement significant differences. Compared NG/Joplin in reading only to conventional graded plans.	MAT	Hi. .22 Av. .43 ** Lo. .29	Rdg. .41 **	.41 **
Enevoldsen (1961)	1-3	Lincoln, Nebraska	420 (210 NG, 210 G) (7 schools)	2 yrs. (2 sch.) 3 yrs. (1 sch.)	Schools matched on SES. IQ used as a covariate. Compared NG/Joplin in reading only to graded programs.	CAT		Rdg. 0	0
Kierstead (1963)	3-8	Orwell, Vermont	277 (111 NG, 166 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Students equated and classified by IQ and pretest. Pretest used to compute gain scores. Compared NG/Joplin in reading only to ability grouping in a graded plan.	ITBS	Hi. -.01 GE Av. +.08 GE Lo. -.14 GE	Rdg. .02 GE	.02 GE

Key:

a A key to the abbreviations used is provided as an appendix to this paper.
* p <.05
** p <.01

Table 2: **Nongraded Programs Involving Multiple Subjects (Comprehensive Programs)**

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies with Evidence of Initial Equality									
Brody (1970)	1-2	Pennsylvania	603 (362 NG, 241 G) (3 schools)	2 yrs.	Students matched on IQ.	SAT	Hi. + Lo. +	Rdg. +.20 Math +.73 **	+.46 **
Otto (1969)	3-5	Austin, Texas	450 (2 upper middle-class lab schools)	2 yrs.	Students matched on pretest achievement.	MAT, ITBS		Rdg. 0 Math 0	0
Perrin (1969)	1-3	Little Rock, Arkansas	288 (144 NG, 144 G) (13 schools)	3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES. Students matched on IQ, age, sex, and race.	MAT (1-2), ITBS (3)		Rdg. +.08 Math +.14	+.11
Buffie (1962)	3	Cedar Falls, Iowa	234 (117 NG 117 G) (8 schools)	3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES, enrollment, class size, and teachers' experience. Students matched on sex, age, and intelligence.	ITBS	Hi. +.39 Lo. +.19	Rdg. +.19 Math +.17 Lang. +.67 **	+.34 **
Guarino (1982)	2-5	New Jersey	162 (81 NG, 81 G) (2 schools)	5 yrs.	Schools matched on SES and ethnic mix. Students matched on age, sex, and IQ.	CAT		Rdg. +.49 ** Math +.19	+.34 *
Ramayya (1972)	6	Darmouth, Nova Scotia	160 (80 NG, 80 G)	6 yrs.	Students matched on sex, IQ, and SES.	TBS		Rdg. +.41* Math +.25 Lang. +.59 *	+.42 *
Muck (1966)	1-3	Buffalo, New York	148 (1 lab school)	3 yrs.	Students matched on mental maturity.	MAT, ITBS		Rdg. +.04 Math -.36 Lang. +.15	-.06
Machiele (1965)	1	Urbana, Illinois	100 (50 NG, 50 G (1 school)	1 yr.	Students matched on IQ, mental age, and chronological age. Compared students in ng program to students in previous yr.	CAT		Rdg. +.61 ** Math +.38	+.49 *

Table 2 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Zerby (1960)	3	Morristown, Pennsylvania	394 (187 NG, 207 G) (2 schools)	3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES. IQ score used to compute achievement beyond anticipated achievement level.	CAT		Rdg. +.10 Math +.57 **	+ 34 *
Chastain (1961)	4-6	Rangey, Colorado	360 (120 NG, 120 NG, 120 G) (1 school)	1 yr.	Students matched on sex and IQ. Pretest used as a covariate.	MAT		Rdg. +.01 Math -.09	-.04
Lawson (1973)	1, 3, 5	Kokomo, Indiana	338 (6 schools)	1, 3, & 5 yrs.	IQ used as a covariate.	CAT		Rdg. + **	+ **
Ross (1967)	1-3	Bloomington, Indiana	314 (128 NG, 186 G) (1 lab school)	6 months	Pretest and IQ used as covariates. Students nonrandomly assigned to NG and G programs in the school.	MAT		Rdg. +.06 GE Math +.06 GE	+.06 GE
Morris (1968)	1-3, 5	Montgomery County, Pennsylvania	117 (57 NG, 60 G) (1 school)	3 yrs.	IQ used as a covariate. Compared students in NG program to students in previous year. Intervention stopped after 3 years.	ITBS, SAT		After 3 yrs. + * After 5 yrs. + **	+ **
Gumpper (1971)	1-4	Pennsylvania	(2 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on SES, enrollment, teachers' characterics, and students' previous academic achievement. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	DLRT, SAT		gr. 1 Rdg. 0 Math (+) gr. 2-4 Rdg. ( ) Math - ** Lang. - **	( )

Key:

[a] A key to the abbreviations used is provided as an appendix to this paper.
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 3: Nongraded Programs Incorporating Individualized Instruction

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Randomized Studies									
Higgins (1980)	3-5	Baton Rouge, Louisiana	246 (75 NG, 171 G) (3 schools)	1 yr.	Students randomly assigned to nongraded/combination or traditional reading classes. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	MRT	Hi. (+) Lo. (+)	Rdg. +.02	+.02
Matched Studies with Evidence of Initial Equality									
Sie (1969)	2-4	Ames, Iowa	124 (67 NG, 67 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on SES. Students matched on SAT scores. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	SAT		Rdg. +.03 Math +.14 Lang. -.11	+.02
Jeffreys (1970)	3, 5	Howard County, Maryland	88 (44 NG, 44 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on SES. Students matched on pretest achievement measure. Pretest scores and parent occup. status used as covariates.	ITBS		Rdg. +.08 Math -.13	-.03
Wilt (1970)	4	Chicago Suburb, Illinois	84 (32 NG, 52 G) (2 schools)	4 yrs.	Students matched on IQ and age.	ITBS		Rdg. +.49 GE * Math +.10 GE Lang. -.27 GE	+.11 GE
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Ward (1969)	1-2	Fort Worth, Texas	797 (376 NG, 421 G) (4 schools)	2 yrs.	Schools matched on SES, race, and available resources. IQ, age, and readiness scores used as covariates.	MAT		Rdg. + Math (+)	+
Burchyette (1972)	3-5	Grand Blanc, Michigan	535 (332 NG, 203 G) (2 schools)	2 yrs.	Schools matched on SES. Pretest used as a covariate.	STEP		Rdg. -.06 Math -.10	-.08

Table 3 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Bowman (1971)	1-6	Burlington, North Carolina	457 (313 NG, 144 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	IQ used as a covariate. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	MAT		Rdg. +.27 * Math +.28 *	+.28 *
Case (1970)	5	Montgomery County, Maryland	269 (131 NG, 138 G) (4 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on SES. Students matched on age, sex, race, and SES (higher IQ scores for control group). Pretest used to compute gain scores.	SAT	Hi. +.18 Av. +.14 Lo. -.01	Rdg. +.01 Math +.16	+.09
Killough (1971)	1-8	Houston, Texas	267 (132 NG, 135 G) (4 schools)	3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES and ethnic distribution. IQ used as a covariate. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	SRAAS		Rdg. + * Math + *	+ *
Givens (1972)	5	Saint Louis, Missouri	100 (50 NG, 50 G) (1 lab, 1 control school)	1 yr.	Students randomly selected from two populations of students that received either individualized or traditional instruction. Ex post facto experimental design. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	ITBS	Hi. (+) Av. 0 Lo. (+)	Rdg. -.11 Math +.10	.00
Walker (1973)	1-12	Kentucky	96 (32 NG, 64 G)	12 yrs.	Schools rated on an eight dimension scale, the Nongradedness Assessment Scale. Longitudinal study to determine the long term effects of NG and G primary school years (1-3). Rate of progress used as a covariate.	CAT		Rdg. +.24 Math +.14 Lang. +.17	+.18

Table 3 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Snake River School District (1972)	1-3	Blackfoot, Idaho	78 (39 NG, 39 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Students matched on SES. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	SRAAS		Rdg. .00 Math .00	.00

Key:

[a] A key to the abbreviations used is provided as an appendix to this paper.
* $p < .05$
** $P < .01$

Table 4: Individually Guided Education (IGE)

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Randomized Studies									
Schneiderhan (1973)	4-6	Roseville, Minnesota	484 (206 IGE, 88 IGI, 190 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Students randomly selected to individually guided instruction or traditional programs in the same school. IQ and pretest scores used as covariates.	ITBS	(IGI and control)	Rdg. 0 Math 0 Lang. 0	0
							(IGE & IGI and control)	Rdg. (-) Math 0 Lang. (+)	
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Price (1977)	4, 6	Iowa	1081 (637 hi, 444 lo) (14 schools)	3 yrs.	Comparison of high and low implementers of 35 processes employed in IGE. Schools matched on size, SES, and location. IQ used as a covariate.	ITBS		Rdg. + * Math (+)	+ *
Biernacki (1976)	3-6	Toledo, Ohio	479 (174 NG, 305 G) (2 schools)	6 months	Schools matched on SES, race, and similar achievement in grade equivalents in reading and math for students in grade 6. Students randomly selected from chosen schools. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	MAT		Rdg. +.13 Math +.20	+.17
Klaus (1981)	4-6	LaCrosse, Wisconsin	433 (219 NG, 214 G)	3 yrs.	Pretest used to compute gain scores. IQ used as a covariate.	ITBS, SRAAS		Rdg. +.07 Math +.12 Lang. -.05	+.05
Bradford (1972)	1-3	Detroit, Michigan	394 (299 NG, 93 G) (2 schools)	1 yr.	Students matched on sex, SES, and reading and math achievement. Pretest used to compute gain scores. IQ used as a covariate.	MAT		Rdg. + Math + *	+ *

Table 4 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Subject	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Burtley (1974)	2-3	Woodberry, Illinois	302 (167 NG, 135 G)	2 yrs.	Schools matched on SES, ethnicity, size, and enrollment. Pretest used to compute gain scores.	MAT		Rdg. +.40 * Math +.55 *	+.48 *
Flowers (1977)	3	Westminster, Colorado	221 (99 NG, 122 G)	3 yrs.	Best school matches available among the remaining schools within the district based on SES. Students classified by SES.	SAT		Rdg. -.25 Lang. -.25	-.25
Kuhlman (1985)	2, 4, 6	Kansas	200 (50 OS, 50 IGE, 100 G)	2 yrs.	Students randomly selected from chosen schools. SES and number-of-parents used as covariates.	KCT		Rdg. 0 Math 0	0
Soumokil (1977)	3, 5	Columbia, Missouri	102 (2 schools)	2 yrs. (gr 3) 3 yrs. (gr 5)	Pretest and IQ used as covariates.	ITBS		Rdg. +.79 ** Math +.80 **	+.80 **
Henn (1974)	4	Ohio	(24 schools) (enrollment: 7 072 NG, 6958 G)	2 yrs.	Schools matched on SES, available resources, and teachers' qualifications.	MAT, OST		Rdg. +.05 Math +.01	+.03

Key:

a A key to the abbreviations used is provided as an appendix to this paper.
* p<.05
** p<.01

Table 5: Studies Lacking an Explicit Description of the Nongraded Program

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Student	Total
Matched Studies with Evidence of Initial Equality									
Hickey (1962)	3	Diocese of Pittsburgh	1348 (745 NG, 603 G) (14 schools)	3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES. Students matched on IQ.	MAT	Hi. +.31 * Av. +.18 Lo. -.01	Rdg. +.24 * Math +.68 **	+.46 **
Lair (1975)	3	Richardson, Texas	463 (183 NG, 280 G) (12 schools)	3 yrs.	Random selection of 6 G and 2 NG schools. Students matched on readiness for learning scores.	CLTBS	Su. -.12 Hi. -.21 Av. -.36	Lang. -.09	-.09
Aigner (1961)	4	Bellevue, Washington	428 (214 NG, 214 G)	3 yrs.	Groups equated with the School and College Abilities Total test.	STEP	Hi. 0 Av. 0 Lo. 0	Rdg. (-) Math (-)	(-)
Mycock (1966)	1	Manchester, England	108 (4 schools)	1 yr.	Schools matched on size, resources, and staff ratio and quality. Students matched on age, sex, and intelligence.	NARA, PT		Rdg. 0 Math 0	0
Reid (1973)	4	Alabama	100 (50 NG, 50 G)	3 yrs.	Students matched on age, sex, and mental ability.	SAT	Hi. -.11 Av. -.01 Lo. -.05	Rdg. +.01 Math -.05 Lang. +.01	-.01
Williams (1966)	3	Hammond, Indiana	76 (38 NG, 38 G)	3 yrs.	Students matched on age, sex, and IQ.	SAT	Hi. +1.29 * Lo. -1.30 *	Rdg. -.46 * Math -.23	-.34
Engel and Cooper (1971)	6	Darmouth, Nova Scotia	40 (20 NG, 20 G) (2 schools)	6 yrs.	Schools selected according to an index for nongradedness. Students matched on IQ.	CAT		Rdg. +1.20 ** Lang. +1.02 **	+1.10 **

Table 5 Con't:

Article	Grades	Location	Sample Size	Duration of Program	Design	Test	Effect Sizes by Achievement	Effect Sizes by Student	Total
Matched Studies Lacking Evidence of Initial Equality									
Herrington (1973)	6	Dade County, Flordia	951 (16 Schools)	1 yr.	Schools randomly selected from SES ranked lists. Classes randomly selected. Pretest used as covariate.	SAT		Rdg. (+) Math +	(+)
Vogel and Bowers (1972)	K-6	Evanston, Illinois	473 (224 NG, 249 G)	1 yr.	Teachers matched on sex, training, experience, and age level taught. Pretest used as covariate.	SAT		composite - **	- **
Hopkins, Oldridge, & Williamson (1965)	3-4	Los Angeles County, California	330 (139 NG, 191 G) (4 schools)	3 yrs.	IQ used as covariate.	CRT		Rdg. +.02	+.02
Carbone (1961)	4-6		244 (122 NG, 122 G) (6 schools)	At least 3 yrs.	Schools matched on SES. Classes randomly selected. Students matched on sex and age. IQ used as covariate	ITBS		Rdg. - ** Math - ** Lang. - **	- **
Remacle (1970)	5-6	Brookings, South Dakota	128 (64 NG, 64 G) (1 school)	2 yrs (gr. 5) 1 yr. (gr. 6)	Random selection of students in control group. IQ used as covariate.	ITBS		Rdg. +.24 GE Math +.37 GE * Lang. +.33 GE	+.31 GE

Key:

a A key to the abbreviations used is provided as an appendix to this paper.
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 6
Summary of Effects by Type of Nongraded Plan

Type of Program	Total Studies	Significant Postive	Non-significant Positive	No Difference	Non-significant Negative	Significant Negative	Median Effect Size[a]
Joplin-Like	9	4	2	1	1	1	+.46 (7)
Comprehensive	14	8	2	1	3	0	+.34 (9)
Individualized	12	2	6	2	2	0	+.02 (9)
IGE	10	4	3	2	1	0	+.11 (6)
Unspecified	12	2	3	1	4	2	+.01 (6)

[a] Number of studies in which an effect size could be computed is presented in parenthesis.